

The Effects of his Political Life
upon
JOHN MILTON

THÈSE COMPLÉMENTAIRE POUR LE DOCTORAT ÈS LETTRES
présentée à la Faculté des Lettres de l'Université de Lyon

PAR

Paul PHELPS MORAND

PARIS
1939

THE EFFECTS OF HIS POLITICAL LIFE

upon

JOHN MILTON

The Effects of his Political Life
upon
JOHN MILTON

THÈSE COMPLÉMENTAIRE POUR LE DOCTORAT ÈS LETTRES
présentée à la Faculté des Lettres de l'Université de Lyon

PAR

Paul PHELPS MORAND

PARIS
1939



To
PROFESSOR DENIS SAURAT



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

ABBREVIATIONS

- Beiblatt* : *Beiblatt zur Anglia*.
- Bohn : *The Prose Works of John Milton*, ed. J. A. St. John, vols. I.-VI, London, Bohn, 1848.
- ELH : *ELH : A Journal of Literary History*.
- Masson : David Masson, *The Life of John Milton : narrated in connection with the Political, Ecclesiastical and Literary History of his Time*. Six volumes, London, Macmillan, 1859 (vol. I, 2d ed., 1881).
- M.L.N. : *Modern Language Notes*.
- M.L.R. : *Modern Language Review*.
- M. P. : *Modern Philology*.
- P. L. : *Paradise Lost*.
- P.M.L.A. : *Publications of the Modern Language Association*.
- P.Q. : *Philological Quarterly*.
- P.R. : *Paradise Regained*.
- P.W. : *The Prose Works of John Milton, with an Introductory Review by Robert Fletcher*. London, William Ball, 1838.
- R.E.S. : *Review of English Studies*.
- S.A. : *Samson Agonistes*,
- S.M. : *The Student's Milton : Being the Complete Poems of John Milton, with the greater part of his Prose Works, now printed in one volume, together with new translations into English of his Italian, Latin and Greek poems*, ed. F. A. Patterson. New-York, Crofts, 1931.
- S.P. : *Studies in Philology*.

INTRODUCTION

In my reading of Milton I was early struck by a certain difference between the first and last parts of his work, and on looking through the critics I was surprised to note that most of them do not even draw attention to this difference. J. H. Hanford, for example, contents himself with saying : « The difference between his earlier and later work is due simply to a shift in the center of his experience and to a consequent widening of his grasp of the moral issues which confront mankind. » (1)

According to him and his confrères, then, the difference is simply the very natural one between a young man and an older one who has become better acquainted with life and has had better opportunities of judging it because of having lived through great events and experiences. For them, that is all. For example, M. Denis Saurat (2), the first to renew in the twentieth century the study of Milton's thought and philosophy as reflected throughout his works, takes his innumerable and pertinent quotations wherever he finds them, irrespective of whether it be in the earlier or the later period.

But to me that method does not seem to correspond to the reality. As I have explained in another work (3) we find in that writer that we may for convenience call the « First Milton », an idealistic young man, at the same time a Platonist and a Christian — a mixture not very exceptional at the time of the Renaissance — possessed of a complete and unquestioning confidence in the Universe, entirely and willingly submissive to Destiny, to God, to what seemed to him to be the sacred order of the world. During this period we may say that the young poet and his poetry shine out to us across the inter-

(1) J. H. HANFORD, *The Youth of Milton* ; in *Studies in Shakespeare, Milton and Donne*, by Members of the English Department of the University of Michigan, New York, Macmillan, 1925, p. 157.

(2) *Milton, Man and Thinker*, New York, Dial Press, 1925.

(3) *De Comus à Satan : L'Œuvre Poétique de John Milton expliquée par sa vie*. Paris, 1939, Partie I.

vening centuries bathed in a pure white light which seems incapable of being dimmed.

During all this blest and benign period he never pauses to think or to make us think, of the Devil, save, no doubt, to mention him from time to time only to dismiss him with a gesture of light scorn. The Devil never for a moment occupies the foreground. On the other hand God, for the idealistic youth, dominates everything. The belief in His absolute and beneficent power is total. Heaven bathes Earth in its rays, we can almost hear its music. All the early poetry of Milton taken together is like a bark floating before the wind over a summer sea, her sails filled with the breath of faith. Faith in beauty, faith in justice, faith in God, sure and undisputed.

But in the later period it is quite otherwise. Whereas in the poetry of Milton's youth the descriptions of Heaven poured forth as from a natural spring, while the Devil had to content himself with a disdainful word or two, in *Paradise Lost* it is not Heaven and the divine goodness which inspire the finest passages. The Christ of *Paradise Regained* is most of the time an unemotional, rather priggish sort of superman, and the words of hope do not convince. The Eternal Father himself cuts a poor figure. On the contrary, Satan is undeniably heroic and plays a grand rôle.

This is not the moment to raise the question whether Satan be the hero of the epic or not. At least he is not recognised by his author as such. But heroic he unquestionably is, and inspired beauties of language surge out of his revolt. It is the turn of the forces of evil, so negligently treated in the poet's youth, to sail with the wind full in their swelling sails, whereas the passages which present the celestial beings and their abode seem too often by comparison weak and tedious. Words of singular weight and amplitude flow under the poet's pen with disconcerting ease for every expression of hatred, of revolt, of blasphemy. Every time Satan is pleased to question the divine laws Milton furnishes him with verses of which none but the greatest poets are capable. When, as usually happens, he goes on to offer a refutation by way of commentary on the eloquent and moving arguments which he has just put into the mouth of Satan, he merely gives us — too late and in less poetic language — a defense of the Almighty that carries no weight of emotion. Under such a cargo the poet's bark seems to tack and beat against the wind.

The inspiration of the poet, grown older, seems generally to flag as he nears the Throne of God (many critics have noticed this) whereas he is in full possession of the splendid powers of his maturity whenever he finds himself in the presence of Satan. Vainly does

his technique, which in his youth was equal to the subject, now try — though grown more perfect with the maturing of his powers — to take the place of inspiration when he speaks of heavenly things.

What is the meaning of this curious reversal, which the mere maturing of a talent cannot explain ?

It seemed to me, as I became aware of this phenomenon in my reading of the poet and set myself to reflect upon it, that it was to be considered not as a normal difference between two periods of literary activity, but rather as an outright contrast, or even a direct contradiction which Milton unconsciously tries to conceal and perhaps succeeds in concealing from himself.

From this conclusion sprang the obvious question : if this opposition cannot be explained by growth, it must then arise from change ; when and how did that change take place ? To seek it in the intermediate period which separates the young poet of the *Hymn on the Morning of Christ's Nativity* from the author of the epic was the natural next step.

For this study the data were already at hand in Liljegren's *Studies in Milton* (1). But this work, published in 1918, had been at once rejected by a number of the best critics and set aside by almost all of them (with the marked exceptions of M. Saurat and Miss M. H. Nicolson). This may have been partly because of the difficult and confused presentation of the material, still more because the author's conclusions were unpalatable and really unjust to Milton.

My task has been to study this work with meticulous care in the light of all the criticisms, which I have analysed and sought to answer, and, judging Liljegren's exposition of the facts as to Milton's political years to be unassailable, to reorganize his arguments (supporting them here and there with contributions of my own) so as to clarify them and make them more easily available.

But although finding myself thus obliged to accept Liljegren's findings on the facts of the case, my conclusions, as will appear in the course of this work, are quite different.

(1) Lund, Gleerup, 1918.

CHAPTER I

MILTON « LATIN SECRETARY »

On Thursday the 15th March, 1648-9, at a meeting of the Council of State of the young Commonwealth, the following decision was taken : « That Mr. Milton be employed as Secretary for Foreign Languages for the Council and that he have the same emoluments as Mr. Weckherlin had for the same service. » (1)

Now John Milton was already known to certain members of the Council of State. If he was not attached to the others as he was to Bradshaw, by friendship and even perhaps (according to Aubrey) (2) by ties of distant kinship, at least he had attached himself to their cause by his writings. Recently, after a silence of four years (the two pamphlets, *Tetrachordon* and *Colasterion* had appeared together in 1645) (3) Milton had just published, exactly two weeks after the execution of King Charles, a pamphlet in which he defended that execution, and whose very title is a political programme : *The Tenure of Kings and Magistrates : proving That it is Lawful, and hath been held so through all Ages, for any, who have the Power, to call to account a tyrant, or Wicked King, and after due conviction to depose, and put him to death ; if the ordinary Magistrate have neglected, or deny'd to do it. And that they, who of late, so much blame Deposing are the Men that did it themselves.* The Author, J. M. London. Printed by Matthew Simmons, at the Gilded Lyon in Aldersgate Street (4).

« This pamphlet », says Masson (5) « implied not only that Milton

(1) MASSON, IV, p. 82.

(2) v. H. DARBISHIRE, *The Early Lives of Milton*, London, Constable, 1932, p. 1.

(3) MASSON, III, p. 301.

(4) MASSON, IV, p. 64.

(5) MASSON, IV, p. 76-77.

had allied his fate to that of the Commonwealth, but also that he now avowed himself a partisan of the regicides and that he was ready to accept the consequences of that alliance. In fact, by his *Tenure of Kings and Magistrates*, he had attached himself more closely than any other man in England to the little group of sixty men of whom Cromwell was the center, and who had become regicides by signing and executing the sentence of death. He thus declared that, had it been necessary, his signature also would have been affixed to the sentence. »

On Tuesday, March 20th, Milton assumed his duties. It was ordered « that the Lord President and four members of the Council receive the oath of secrecy of the secretaries » (1).

We may learn from the following quotations from the Official Journal of the Council what Milton's functions were. It is astonishing to note the variety of uses to which a « Latin Secretary » may be put.

1649.

1. March 26.

That Mr. Milton be appointed to make some observations upon a Paper lately printed, called *Old and New Chains*. (Lilburne's *England's New Chains Discovered*.)

2. March 28.

That Mr. Milton be appointed to make some observations upon the complication of interests which is now amongst the several designers against the peace of the Commonwealth ; and that it be made ready to be printed with the Papers out of Ireland which the House hath ordered to be printed.

2. April 20.

That the letters brought in by Mr. Watkins be viewed by Mr. Frost or Mr. Milton, to see if any of them contain anything concerning the exportation of any prohibited goods.

4. May 7.

That Sir Henry Mildmay do report to the House that they do find that there are divers dangerous books printed and published with the license of Mr. Mabbott upon them, and that, upon the examining of them, they find he hath given his license to divers of them ; to desire the House that he may be discharged from that trust ; and likewise to move the House that care may be taken for the suppression of all such books and pamphlets, and especially of that commonly known by the name of *The Moderate*.

(1) MASSON, IV, p. 83.

5. May 12.

That the Lord President do prepare and bring in an Act concerning the prohibiting of the printing of invective and scandalous Pamphlets against the Commonwealth.

6. May 14.

That Mr. Hall shall be employed by this Council to make answer to such Pamphlets as shall come out to the prejudice of this Commonwealth, and that he shall have £ 100 *per annum* for his labour, ...that he shall sign the test signed by others employed by this Council.

7. June 11.

That Mr. Milton and Mr. Serjeant (Dendy) shall view the papers of Mr. Small, and deliver out unto him such as are only of private concern, and the rest to bring to this Council ...and that his plate, money, and goods, shall thereupon be free from being kept under restraint or sealing up.

8. June 23.

That Mr. Milton do examine the papers of *Pragmaticus*, and report what he finds in them to the Council (1).

9. July 16.

That Mr. Randolph be continued in his place of Clerk of the Papers of State at Whitehall ...and Mr. Milton is to have an inspection into that office.

10 Oct. 24.

That a warrant be issued to Mr. Milton and to Mr. Serjeant Dendy to view the books and papers of Mr. Clement Walker that are seized at Kensington, and such others as he hath here in Westminster or elsewhere, and to report what they find to the Council.

11. Nov. 19.

That Mr. Milton shall have the lodgings that were in the hands of Sir John Hippesley in Whitehall, for his accommodation as being Secretary to this Council for Foreign Languages.

12. Nov. 21.

The letters concerning Lady Killigrew, in the custody of Mr. Milton, to be brought to Council, that some resolution may be taken about the pass desired. « As long ago as May 12 there had been a council-warrant to the Serjeant-at-arms to seize Lady Killigrew at the Savoy, suspected of holding intelligence with the enemy and her letters, papers and ciphers. » (Masson, IV, p. 150.)

(1) MASSON. IV, pp. 87-89.

1650.

13. Jan. 8.

That Mr. Milton do prepare something in answer to the book of Salmasius, and when he hath done it bring it to the Council.

14. Jan. 14.

A supply of « The Public Acts » and of « Mr. Milton's books » to be sent to Mr. Robinson, « to spread in those parts where he is » (1).

15. Feb. 23.

Memorandum : That Mr. John Milton, Secretary for the Foreign Languages, Mr. Edward Dendy, Serjeant-at-arms, and Mr. Gualter Frost the younger, assistant to the Secretary, did this day take the Engagement following : « I, being nominated by this Council to be ...for the year to come, do promise in the sight of God that, through his grace, I will be faithful in the performance of the trust committed to me, and not reveal or disclose anything, in whole or in part, directly or indirectly, that shall be debated or resolved upon in the Council, and ordered to be kept secret by the said Council, without the command, direction, or allowance, of the Parliament or Council. »

16. May 6.

Ordered, That Mr. Milton do attend the Lords Commissioners of the Great Seal with the papers given in by Dr. Walsall concerning the goods of *Felones de se* ; to whom it is referred to take such course therein, for the advantage of the Commonwealth, as they shall think fit.

17. May 15.

Ordered that a certain person brought to town by Cornet Joyce be searched by Mr. Serjeant Dendy, and that his trunks be brought in and thoroughly searched by Mr. Milton, who is to report tomorrow what he finds in them.

18. June 14.

That Mr. Milton shall have a warrant ...to the Trustees and Contractors for the sale of the Kings goods for the furnishing of his lodging in Whitehall with some hangings.

19. June 22.

That Mr. Milton do go to the Committee of the Army, and desire them to send to this Council the book of Examinations taken about the risings in Kent and Essex.

(1) MASSON. IV, pp. 145-52.

20. June 25.

That Mr. Milton do peruse the Examinations taken by the Committee of the Army concerning the insurrections in Essex, and that he do take heads of the same, to the end the Council may judge what is fit to be taken into consideration.

21. June 26.

That the Declaration of the Parliament be translated into Latin by Mr. Milton, into Dutch by Mr. Haak, and into French by Monsieur Augier.

22. Aug. 14.

That Mr. Thomas Goodwin, Mr. Byfield, Mr. Bond, Mr. Nye, Mr. Durie, Mr. Frost, Mr. Milton, or any three of them, of which Mr. Frost or Mr. Milton to be one, be appointed to view and to inventory all the records, writings, and papers whatsoever, belonging to the Assembly of the Synod, to the end they may not be embezzled, and may be forthcoming for the use of the Commonwealth.

23. Aug. 17.

That £ 50 be paid by Mr. Frost to Mr. Theodore Haak and so much also to Mr. Samuel Hartlib, in regard of the many good services by them done by their correspondency in parts beyond the seas, and to enable them to continue it.

1651

24. Feb. 10.

That the way of treating with the Public Minister of Portugal be by a Committee of the Council... That Mr. Milton, the Secretary for Foreign Tongues, be appointed to attend the Committee at their meetings (1).

25. June 18.

That thanks be given to Mr. Milton, on the behalf of the Commonwealth, for his good service done in writing an answer to the Book of Salmasius, written against the proceedings of the Commonwealth of Engl. : And it is ordered that ye sum of... hundred pounds be given to him as reward from this Council for his... Salmasius. (*The above entry is crossed out, and the following substituted*) : The Council, taking notice of the many good services performed by Mr. John Milton, their Secretary for Foreign Languages, to this State and Commonwealth, particularly of his Book in vindication of the Parliament and People

(1) MASSON, IV, pp. 224-31.

of England against the calumnies and invectives of Salmasius, have thought fit to declare their resentment and good acceptance of the same, and that the thanks of the Council be returned to Mr. Milton, and their sense represented in that behalf (1).

1652 .

26. March 11.

That Mr. Weckherlin be appointed Secretary Assistant for the business of Foreign Affairs (2).

No. 1.

It is to be observed that one of the first tasks assigned to Milton was to attack that most picturesque figure of his time, John Lilburne, for a pamphlet whose significant title of *Old and New Chains* (3) shows that tyranny is passing from Charles to the Council of which Milton has just become secretary, that power has merely changed hands. John Lilburne (« Freeborn John ») and his sect, the « Levelers », were the most uncompromising of Republicans. They desired the perfect equality of the early Christians ; all men are equal, only God is above them.

Lilburne had already suffered for his ideas under the monarchy ; after a beating at the tail of a cart by the hangman, and the pillory, he had been imprisoned for two years when not yet over twenty (4). It was Cromwell, whose harshest critic he afterwards became, who presented the petition for his liberation. He began his public life in the service of Prynne, whose pamphlets he distributed while the latter was in prison ; but the divergence between their points of view soon became evident. As Gardiner says : « Prynne was the narrowest of conservatives ; Lilburne was the most extreme of revolutionists... To Prynne the very notion of individual liberty was hateful ; Lilburne was so enamoured of it that he advocated something like the negation of law. » (5)

At Marston Moor, Lilburne fought bravely as lieutenant-colonel, and was still a great admirer of Cromwell ; but shortly afterwards, rather than sign the « Covenant » of the Presbyterians, he withdrew

(1) MASSON, IV, p. 321.

(2) MASSON, IV, p. 425.

(3) The exact title of Lilburne's work is *England's New Chains Discovered*. (MASSON, IV, p. 87).

(4) S. R. GARDINER, *The Fall of the Monarchy*, London, Longmans, Green, 1895, I, p. 30-32.

(5) *History of the Great Civil War*, London, Longmans, Green, 1893, II, pp. 110-111.

from the army to devote himself anew to his pamphleteering (1). In 1647, his « Levellers » formulated their « Agreement of the People », which went much further in theory than the ideas of the Independents (where Milton ranged himself) or the army. It demanded the abolition of all hereditary privileges, a single parliamentary chamber, and total liberty of conscience, even for « Papists » ; Lilburne wished justice for all, even for the King (2). « The Independents wanted power » says Guizot (3) ; « the Levellers, equality ».

From the time of the publication of his *New Chains*, Lilburne's history consists of a series of alternations between his sojourns in the Tower (whence he continued to send forth pamphlets blazing with resentment against Cromwell's dictatorship) and his appearances in answer to summons before Parliament, when he refused to kneel before the bar, kept his hat on, and spoke in his own behalf without fear of death but rather with a desire for martyrdom in the cause of liberty. He was always the darling of the populace, whose rights he defended so passionately. En 1651, the Government, tired of his demonstrations, banished him for life.

Masson says of him (4) :

On the whole, I like him myself, and am glad he is in the History of England, but think he was an ass.

But Gardiner expresses himself with a deeper comprehension :

...it is easy to condemn him as a fanatic who suffered on behalf of opinions which, even when they were true, were exaggerated out of all proportion to their value. The fact of his readiness to suffer was — irrespective of the causes of his sufferings — the offering which he had to make to a generation which was striving to break the bonds which law and custom imposed on the energies of the individual. (5)

Milton's reply to Lilburne's *New Chains*, if it was ever written, was not published (6). Cromwell in the meanwhile had replied himself by ordering some of his adversaries to be shot (7). Lilburne was not intimidated by this, it was indeed impossible to intimidate him. Milton may even have been present (8) at the famous meeting of the Council at which Freeborn John, keeping his hat on his head, dared defy the Council in the name of Milton's own principles.

(1) *Op. cit.*, II, p. 195.

(2) *Op. cit.*, III, pp. 386-87.

(3) *Études sur l'histoire de la révolution d'Angleterre : Portraits politiques des hommes des différents partis. Parlementaires. Cavaliers. Républicains. Niveleurs*, Paris, Didier, 1855, pp. 168-69.

(4) IV, p. 120, Note I.

(5) *Great Civil War*, II, p. 112. Besides the references given above, see for Lilburne Gardiner's *History of the Commonwealth and the Protectorate*, London, Longmans, Green, 1896, I, pp. 33-34. 49-54 ; Masson, III, 387-90, 528-30, IV, pp. 119-20, 357-59. For a comparison of Lilburne's attitude with Milton's, see D. M. Wolfe : *Milton, Lilburne, and the People*, M. P., XXXI (1934) pp. 253-72.

(6) Masson, IV, pp. 97-98. The official reply published by the Council was by Hall.

(7) Masson, IV, p. 48-58.

(8) Masson, IV, p. 87.

No. 2.

It was a question of saying as much as possible against « those inhuman rebels and papists » (1) in Ireland, doubtless in order to prepare public opinion for the bloody expedition which took place some months later (2). No one certainly could have been more ready than Milton to prepare the destruction of the Irish Catholics. A bloody attack (3) against the Protestants in Ireland in 1641 was ever present to his mind, and he believed at that time that the Irish had massacred as many as six hundred thousand Protestants : (4)

Nos. 3, 7, 9, 10, 12, 16, 17.

Under all these headings we take note of operations, such as the secret police of all governments, particularly in times of revolution or of dictatorships, have always performed. The remarkable thing about these items is to find associated with the name of a chief of secret police, that of the poet Milton. We have to recognize that to some extent Milton had a share in such activities, and it would probably be impossible to exaggerate the psychological and moral transformation which tasks of this nature may have worked upon the author of the *Hymn upon the Morning of Christ's Nativity* and of *Comus*. Indeed, the difference of tone even between his prose writings of that time and those that preceded his work as « Latin Secretary », is considerable (5).

Nos. 4, 5, 8.

We note that in May the Council was already working at Bradshaw's famous Press Act (6), which was to muzzle the press more harshly than King Charles had ever tried to do. The relation of these orders to Milton's activities will be discussed in Chapter III.

(1) *Observations upon the Articles of Peace with the Irish Rebels*. (Bohn, II, p. 180).

(2) Cromwell arrived in Ireland August 15th, 1649. The Drogheda massacre took place on Sept. 11. v. GARDINER : *History of the Commonwealth and Protectorate*, IV, pp. 112-122.

(3) v. S. R. GARDINER, *The Fall of the Monarchy of Charles : 1637-1649*, London, Longmans, Green, 1884, II, pp. 308-13.

(4) *Observations*, etc., Bohn, II, p. 183. GARDINER dit (*Epochs of Modern History* : London, Longmans, Green, 1913. *The Puritan Revolution*, p. 120 : « The lowest estimate of the destruction which was able to gain credit in England raised to 30,000 the number of the victims ». Cf. *History of the Commonwealth and the Protectorate*, I, p. 124, note 4. And in *Eikonoklastes*, published in october of the same year, we read : « The rebellion and horrid massacre of English Protestants in Ireland, to the number of 154,000 in the province of Ulster only... which added to the other three, makes up the total sum of that slaughter in all likelihood four times as great ». (*S. M.*, p. 819.). And cf. also these sentences from his *Reason of Church Government*, published in February, 1642, three months after the event which had so filled him with horror : « Those murderous Irish, » (*S. M.*, p. 521), « a barbarous crew of rebels, » (*S. M.*, p. 522).

(5) v. *infra*, p. 57.

(6) MASSON, IV, p. 116.

No. 18.

As usually happens in such cases, the revolutionaries as soon as they came to power established themselves in their victim's palace and commenced dividing his property amongst themselves.

No. 23.

Here it is a question of a source of private information on foreign matters that must not be confused with the regular « Intelligence Service ». Hartlib was one of Milton's best friends ; the treatise *On Education* was dedicated to him (1). This is perhaps the place to note, however, that Stoupe, a real spy, was amongst Milton's acquaintances (2). Milton mentions him in a letter to Eméric Bigot (3).

No. 25.

We shall have occasion to speak of this paragraph in the last chapter (4).

No. 26.

This paragraph marks the date at which Milton, his sight now completely gone, had his work and his salary reduced.

(1) MASSON, III, p. 233.

(2) MASSON, V, pp. 284, 287-89 ; GARDINER, *History of the Commonwealth and Protectorate*, III, p. 112, 115, 157.

(3) LETTER 21, (*P. W.*, p. 839).

(4) v. *infra*, pp. 101-104.

CHAPTER II

THE *EIKON BASILIKÉ*

The history of the *Eikon Basiliké* and of Milton's reply to it presents a knotty and at the same time exciting problem. There are elements in it which remain mysterious to this day and which drew the Scandinavian scholar Liljegren (1), now professor in the University of Greifswald, to go over all the evidence anew, with infinite care and a greater impartiality than party prejudice had permitted in the intervening centuries. The question is so important for an understanding of the poet that was eight or nine years later to begin the writing of *Paradise Lost*, that we must examine it as carefully as possible.

I. THE KNOWN FACTS.

First, the undisputed facts in the case. On February 9, 1648-9, just ten days after the execution of the King, there was published « with great secrecy and in very mysterious circumstances » (2), with no printer's or publisher's name on the title-page, a volume which purported to be a sort of spiritual testament of the « martyred » King Charles. It contained a miscellany of meditations and theological discussions by the King himself, together with advice to his son, affectionate allusions to the Queen, fragments of autobiography and reflections upon death. Its sub-title was : *The True Portraicture of His Sacred Majestie in His Solitudes and Sufferings*, and the tone was that of a perfect Christian, noble and resigned in the face of overwhelming events which he suffers and accepts with submission. It reflected a dignity at once royal and humble.

(1) *Op. cit.*, pp. 39-152.

(2) MASSON, IV, p. 33.

The circumstances of its publication as pieced together by Masson (1), with all his honesty and industry, seem to have been as follows :

In October, 1648, when Charles I, was still in the Isle of Wight... Royston, who had printed for his Majesty before, had a message from him to be ready to print some papers that were to be sent. Not long after, ...Royston did receive what he believed to be the promised papers. They were conveyed to him by a Rev. Edward Symmons, who had been chaplain to the Prince of Wales, and had published a book vindicating the King from the attack upon him on account of his Papers taken at Naseby. Perceiving the importance of the manuscript, and its bearing on the King's critical condition, Royston had it printed with all despatch, but with the greatest precautions for secrecy. He employed several different printing-presses, but chiefly those of a Mr. William Dugard, an excellent printer, who combined his trade-business with the duties of no less important an office than the mastership of Merchant Taylors' School, and was well known to London scholars in both capacities... The book was ready just at the time of the King's execution, and was out in London, as we have seen, on the 9th of February... The tradition, from Royston himself, is that he had taken care to have 2000 copies that day, at fifteen shillings each, in the hands of hawkers ; and through the next five weeks... the sale was such as to keep Dugard's and other presses constantly at work.

The success of the « King's Book » was tremendous. Innumerable editions in all the European languages made it known almost at once on the Continent as well as in England (2). There were indeed before the end of the second month a few doubts raised as to the royal authorship of the work. There were those who said it should be attributed not to the King but to some divine or prelate or other. But for the vast majority of the people it remained simply the last testament of King Charles to his subjects and made a saint of the « Royal Martyr », as Masson says (3).

All this was a serious blow for the regicides. What could they do against this new Bible of their enemies, which made of King Charles in the public mind a kind of second Christ and placed themselves in the light of a Pontius Pilate or a Judas ? It was impossible to seize all the copies of a work that was sought by the faithful with such passionate intensity that punishment hindered no one. Nevertheless, on the 16th of March, five weeks after the publication of the « King's Book », Parliament gave orders for its seizure (4).

(1) IV, p. 148.

(2) MASSON, IV, pp. 129-32.

(3) IV, pp. 36-37. « By means of this book, in fact... there was established, within a few weeks after the death of Charles I., that marvellous worship of his memory, that passionate recollection of him as the perfect man and the perfect king, the saint, the martyr, the all but Christ on earth again, which persisted till the other day as a positive religious *cultus* of the English mind, and still lingers in certain quarters. »

(4) MASSON, IV, p. 148.

There are two documents, dated this same 16th of March, 1648-9, which present a remarkable coincidence and are essential for this whole problem of the *Eikon*. One is the above-mentioned official order of Parliament. The other is the following « extraordinary entry » in the books of the Stationers' Company, thus recorded by Masson : (1)

Mr. Simmons entered for his copy, under the hands of Mr. Caryl and Mr. Dawson, warden, a book called *Eikon Basiliké : The Portraiture of his late Majesty in his solitude and sufferings*. (The entry, as it is now seen in the books, is deleted with three crosses, and there is this explanatory note in the margin) : « This is crossed out by my own hand, Aug. 6th, 1651, Matthew Simmons, at a court held that day. »

~ This Dr. Caryl was one of the favourite preachers of the Council of State ; he served as censor during a certain period, and Milton's *Colasterion* bears his name as licenser. Simmons, who thus took out his copyright for the *Eikon*, was Milton's own printer and his friend, and was the chief bookseller of the Commonwealth. Masson cites this entry with bewilderment and a certain dismay, at the end of a footnote in which he summarizes and dismisses rather rapidly the accusations against Milton, but without offering any clear explanation of it :

But, if any Anti-Ikonoklast still wants to work out some profound solution of the Pamela Prayer mystery, on the assumption that the *Eikon* was really the King's and that the Regicides diabolically contrived the interpolation (2), have we not furnished means that may be converted to mischief (though *how* we cannot quite conjecture) in that unexplained and cancelled entry... ? Could not a story be spun out of *that* ? (3)

That 16th of March has still another importance for this study. It was the morrow of the day on which the Council had nominated Milton to the post of Secretary for Foreign Languages. He had not as yet assumed his duties and we do not know on what date he was ordered as the party's man of letters to make a reply to the *Eikon*. The order is not mentioned in the official record of the Orders of the Council, but Milton himself speaks of it twice. In the preface to his *Eikonoklastes* he says : « I take it on me [this work] as a work assigned rather, than by me chosen » (4), and in *Defensio secunda pro populo anglicano* he affirms : « I was ordered to answer it and I opposed the *Iconoclast* to his *Icon*. » (5)

Meanwhile several months slipped by and despite the parliamen-

(1) *ibid.*

(2) But the two assumptions are not interdependent.

(3) IV, p. 250, note.

(4) *S. M.*, p. 776.

(5) *Huic respondere jussus, Iconi Iconoclasten opposui. (P. M., p. 720 ; ВОНН, I, p. 261).*

tary order of seizure the *Eikon* was working upon the public mind. The engraved frontispiece played its part. The King was represented on his knees beside a table on which lay his Bible. The crown had fallen from his head, but in his right hand he held a crown of thorns and his eyes were fixed upon a brilliant crown of glory which hovered and shone in the air just above him.

All of the many editions of this work contained prayers written by the King, woven through the text and placed generally at the ends of chapters. But certain editions contain four additional prayers grouped together ; still others, three of these four. The first of them, the one which is sometimes lacking, was no more and no less noticed or noticeable than the rest. Entitled « Prayer in Time of Captivity », it is equally noble in language and equally well adapted to the circumstances. It was these prayers above all which caught the imagination of the public and touched all hearts, and which finally consecrated King Charles in the English Book of Common Prayer as a saint.

Finally on October 6th, 1649, Milton's rejoinder to the *Eikon* appeared from the press. It was signed with his initials and printed by Simmons (1). It is a rather heavy work and lacking in literary quality. The tone is harsh and self-assured and does not attract the reader's sympathy. It replies to the royal work chapter by chapter, analyzes it and derides it in a spirit of hatred. Milton's censure of every one of the late King's acts is generally well-founded ; but as the tone of the arguments is neither elevated enough nor popular enough to catch the public ear, it could not compete with the emotional effect of the *Eikon*. Nevertheless, Milton's book threw into dismay the partisans of the royal cause. If credited, it diminished and nearly destroyed the *Eikon's* power. Why was this ? Because, in the middle of its heavy pages, the *Eikonoklastes* set forth a shocking and inexplicable discovery, viz. that the first of the four supplementary prayers mentioned above as to be found in very many editions of the *Eikon*, was undeniably plagiarized from a novel by Sir Philip Sidney, that *Arcadia* that had been fashionable reading in all Elizabethan boudoirs. Its phraseology is identical, save for a few phrases modified or added with the design of adapting it to the circumstances of the royal captivity, with the romantic supplication offered by Pamela, the heroine, on behalf of her lover to the pagan gods ! The moment the parallel was pointed out, it was sufficient to set the two pages side by side in order to convince the most sceptical.

It is important to note, however, that there were some who very early expressed their suspicions of the supposed plagiarism and affirm-

(1) MASSON, IV, p. 132-33.

ed their belief that the regicides themselves might have suborned the printer to put it in. But such suppositions were then unsupported by proof and remained without effect. A dangerous breach had been opened in the side of the royal vessel. Milton took advantage of the fact when Parliament asked him for a second edition of the *Eikonoklastes*, and considerably enlarged the space given to the question of the Pamela prayer.

Two pairs of questions are raised immediately with respect to the mysterious *Eikon Basiliké* :

1. (a) : Was the King really the author of the « King's Book » ?
(b) : If not, who was ?

2. (a) : Did the author of the book, whoever he was, also make the adaptation of the Pamela Prayer ? (b) : If not, who did make it and insert it in the later editions of the *Eikon* ?

To the first pair we now have an answer which nobody questions. In 1686 there was discovered (1) in a certain copy of the *Eikon* which had formerly belonged to Lord Anglesey, the following statement written by the latter on the fly-leaf in his own hand :

King Charles II and the Duke of York (2) both of them at the last session of Parliament in 1675, showed me the manuscript copy of this book containing many corrections in the King's own handwriting, and assured me that the work had not been compiled by the King but by Dr. Gauden, Bishop of Exeter. The which I inscribe here to undeceive the public on this point, witnessing it by my signature. Anglesey (3).

Gauden was dead. His curate, Anthony Walker confirmed the memorandum. In 1693 there was published some correspondence, dated 1661, just after the Restoration, in which Gauden, referring to himself as « the unfortunate Bishop of Exeter », requests from Chancellor Hyde (4), his payment in clerical promotion for an extraordinary service rendered to the late King and the royalist cause. Receiving no reply, he loses his temper and threatens to address himself directly to Charles II, then explains what « this extraordinary service » was : « This book [the *Eikon Basiliké*] was entirely and exclusively invented, conceived and executed by me, in order to vindicate the King's wisdom, honour and piety. » (5)

Hyde, after having left several more letters without response, finally wrote : « The information which you repeat to me had been, I con-

(1) By Millington, a second-hand book-dealer and a friend of Milton's. v. « Explanatory Notes and Remarks on Milton's *Paradise Lost*, » by Jonathan Richardson, Father and Son, London, 1734, (DARBISHIRE. *op. cit.*, p. 203).

(2) Afterwards King James I.

(3) *The Life of John Milton*, 1698, by John Toland. (DARBISHIRE, *op. cit.*, p. 145).

(4) Later Lord CLARENDON, Royalist historian of *The Great Rebellion*.

(5) MASSON, VI, 429.

fess, confided to me in secret, and I had not considered myself at liberty to take account of it. And truly, when it ceases to be a secret, I know of no one who will be glad of it save Mr. Milton. I have very much wished that it had not been confided to me. » (1)

The question of authorship being thus settled, a more difficult one remains to be considered : who must be held responsible for the insertion of Pamela's Prayer into those editions of the *Eikon* that contain it ? In setting it forth, we must continue to lean heavily upon Professor Liljegren.

II. WAGSTAFFE AND HILLS.

In 1693 was published *The Vindication of King Charles* by the royalist Wagstaffe, from which we quote the following paragraphs : (2)

I know but one objection more, and that respects a Prayer added to some Editions of the King's Book as used by the King, and said to be taken out of a Romance, etc. Now, altho I know no manner of harm in this, and the Objection is plainly peevish and querulous... yet there is great reason to believe, that the King did never make use of it, for that it is not found in the First, nor in several other the most early Editions of this Book. And for the Readers satisfaction in this Point, I have here subjoin'd a Catalogue of the several Editions of it, both without and with the Prayers, Collected with great Care and Industry, by Mr. Keeble at the Turks Head in Fleet-street ; & for preventing any Mistake, he hath with great Exactness given the Size of each Volume, the Time of Printing... And in which it is observable, that there are no less than Twenty-six Editions without the Prayers, and Sixteen of them Printed 1648 (3).

In 1697, in his second edition, Wagstaffe states :

But since the first editon of this Vindication, I have received full and convincing Information concerning the Mystery of this Prayer that it was an artifice of Bradshaw, or Milton or Both, and by them surreptiously thrust into the King's Works, to discredit the whole. This Information comes originally from Mr. Hill [Hills], the Printer, but convey'd by two very worthy Gentlemen, and against whom there can be no possible Exception, Dr. Gill and Dr. Bernard, who both were Phisitians to him, and very intimate with him and because their Testimony is so very important, the Reader shall have it in their own words :

May 1st. 1694.

Sir : (4)

I most readily comply with your Request in informing you from whom I heard what I was saying (the last time I had the honour to be in your

(1) MASSON, VI, p. 433.

(2) The quotations from Wagstaffe's work are taken from LILJEGREN, *op. cit.*, pp. 56-64.

(3) That is to say, before March 25th, 1649, according to our present calendar. (Milton was appointed to his secretaryship on the 15th, and assumed his duties the 20th.).

(4) This letter is addressed to Sir Charles HATTON.

Company). That I was told Pamela's Prayer, was transferr'd out of Sir Philip Sidney's Arcadia into Eikon Basiliké by a contrivance of Bradshaw's and Milton's. Sir I make no secret of it, and I frankly tell you my Author, who was Mr. Henry Hill Oliver's Printer, and the occasion, as he many years ago told me, was this, Mr. Dugard, who was Milton's intimate Friend, happen'd to be taken printing an Edition of the King's Book ; Milton used his interest to bring him off, which he effected by the means of Bradshaw, but upon this Condition that Dugard should add Pamela's Prayer to the aforesaid Book he was printing, as an attonement for his fault, they designing thereby to bring a scandall upon the Book, and to blast the Reputation of its Author, pursuant to which design they industriously took care afterwards as soon as published to have it taken notice off. Mr. Hill hath affirm'd this to me several times of his own knowledge, and I need not tell you how easy it was for him to know it, who being a forward, and confiding man who was in most of the intrigues of that time, and intrusted with business of the greatest privacy by the then governing Partys, and no man that I have ever met with was better vers't in the Secret History of that time than himself, as I have found by the often discourse I had with him, for being his Phisitian for several years, I had many opportunities to talk with him about these affaires, from whom I have received a different account of the transactions of those times, than what was commonly known or made Publick, and many passages that I was a stranger to before. Thus Sir I have given you my Authority, for what I said, which if you please, you may communicate to the Rest of our Friends and believe me alwaies.

Your most Humble Servant,

THO. GILL.

There are two letters from Dr. Bernard presented by Wagstaffe, and given below. The second, to Dr. Goodall, is of anterior date, but was published later, in the third edition of Wagstaffe's *Vindication* : published in 1711 :

I do remember very well that Mr. Henry Hill, the Printer, told me that he had heard Bradshaw and Milton laugh at their inserting a Prayer out of Sir Philip Sidney's Arcadia at the end of King Charles's his book and then Milton had jeer'd it in his answer, adding withall that they were men would stick at nothing that might gain their point and this I testifie.

FRANCIS BERNARD.

May 10th, 1694.

Concerning the Prayer out of Sir Philip Sidney, which Milton made a great bustle about, I remember Henry Hills (who was Oliver's Printer, and my Patient) told me among other things, of the Artifice of that Party ; that he had heard Bradshaw and Milton laugh how they had put the Cheat upon the World ; and in order thereunto had printed the whole Book anew, that they might add that Prayer thereunto ; and that they were not more studious of any thing, than to rob that Good King of the Reputation of that Book. I doubt not, but Dr. Gill can remember something to this purpose from the same Hen. Hills. I am.

Your most assured humble Servant,

FRANCIS BERNARD.

March 13. 1693.

Wagstaffe then makes another excellent point :

It does not anywhere appear, that Sir Philip Sidney's *Arcadia* was a Book that the King used to read or delight in... (witness) Sir Thomas Herbert, who waited on the King from the time of his Imprisonment at Holdenby to his Death ; who had the Charge of the King's Books, and gives a particular Account of what Books the King read, either in his Serious Studies, or for Divertisement and alleviating his Spirits. And he mentions the Sacred Scriptures, Bishop Andrews's Sermons, Hooker's Ecclesiastical Polity, Villalpandus upon Ezekiel, Sandys's Paraphrase, Herbert's Poems ; and among the less Serious, Godfrey of Bulloigne ; Torquato Tasso, Englished by Mr. Fairfax ; Ariosto, by Sir John Harrington ; and Spencer's Fairy-Queen. And these are all he mentions, but not the least Syllable nor Intimation of *Pembroke's Arcadia*, which Book had the King often used, or delighted much in the reading of it, to be sure he never would have omitted it ; for it was as considerable in its kind, and deserv'd as much Commendation, as those other Facetious Authors, that he did mention ; and his pretermittting it, is a good Argument that the King did not make use of it, and had it not by him to read, if he been at any time so disposed. But on the other side, it is plain enough that Milton was very well acquainted with it (1), that he had spent much time in reading it, and that the Book was very familiar to him.

Another argument supported by very telling testimony which we find in Wagstaffe must likewise be quoted at length :

It deserves Inquiry, who it was that carried these Prayers to be printed, or, by whose hand they were conveyed to the Press ? All the Prints that I have seen, which give any Account of them, only say, they were deliver'd by the King into the hands of Juxon Bishop of London, at his Death. And this Milton himself confirms... Now from hence it will appear plainly and undeniably, that that Party [the Revolutionaries] and they only were the Persons who conveyed these Prayers to the Press, and caused them to be Printed... For whatever Papers soever the King might deliver to Bishop Juxon, it is most certain he [Juxon] could Print none of them, nor yet keep them to himself. For the Regicides immediatly laid Hands on him, and Imprisoned him, Examined him with all the Rigor and Severity imaginable... searched him Narrowly for all Papers that he might have from the King... and moreover rifled all the King's Cloaths, Scrutures, Cabinets and Boxes, and whatever they found, they kept in their own Hands... For they were all taken, and never (like those at Naseby) restor'd again but all was kept in their own custody. The conclusion is this : that after that time whatever was printed, must have come from themselves ; and if any of the Papers that the King deliver'd to Bishop Juxon at his Death were made Publick, they are the Persons who were the Publishers, and no others. Because no other Persons had them in their Power, but themselves. And there is no doubt but that Milton himself first brought these Prayers, and got them printed at Dugard's Press, and from thence they were quickly translated to Mr. Royston's ; for every little Addition having the King's name to it, quickened the Sale, and made all Booksellers, so soon as they had notice

(1) *v. infra*, p. 29, note (2).

of it, add the Prayers to their own Editions, supposing them all genuine... Tis very probable that some of these Prayers were such as were used and penn'd by the King. For it would have been ridiculous and impolitick to have counterfeited four Prayers, when it was one only they had to play upon, and they suffer'd those that were genuine to pass, to give Countenance to the other...

And I have a very good evidence that the King left but three Prayers behind him and deliver'd to Bishop Juxon no more but Three Prayers, the Fourth, that is Pamela's, was of their own framing. It is the Testimony of the same Gentlewoman, the Daughter of Sir Ralph Whitfield (whom I have mention'd before) [Mrs. Fotherly] in these Words : And farther she says, that within two Days after the King's Death, she saw in a Spanish-Leather-Case three of those Prayers that are printed in some, if not all (1) the Editions of that Book, which were said to be used by him in the time of his Restraint, and delivered to the Bishop of London at his Death ; from whom they were taken away by the Officers of the Army ; and it was from one of those Officers in whose custody they then were, that she had the Favour to see them ; and that the Person who shew'd her those Prayers shewed her also the George with the Queen's Picture in it, and two Seals which were the King's. This farther confirms the Truth, that the Prayers were only in their Custody ; and moreover that the Number of those Prayers were but Three, the Fourth is their own...I have yet to add to this that King Charles II had so little Opinion of the Prayers added to this Book, that when Royston asked his leave for the reprinting it in 1680, he gave him leave, but expressly order'd he should leave out those additional Prayers... It is to be observed, that this was five Years after the pretended Memorandum (2).

This I had from Mr. Norton, who was Mr. Royston's Printer, and I have it by me attested under his Hand, Aug. 8, 1693, in these Words : « I find in my Book, March 15, 1680, I received from Mr. Royston a parcel of Papers in order to Print the King's Meditations, about which at that time I had several conferences with him ; he said he would not print it, until he had the King's leave ; some few Days after he had his Majesty's leave to print it, but without any Additions of Prayers ; and which Mr. Royston liked very well, for he feared, whilst he absconded, his Servants had some Tricks put upon them [that is, back in the spring of 1649] in the Additional Prayers, tho' he could not say with certainty that he who brought it to his Servants, was sent by Mr. Milton, but he much suspected it.

It will be convenient here to summarize Wagstaffe's arguments, changing somewhat their order and avoiding their author's frequent repetitions. Considering that one of the reasons why Liljegren's arguments were so lightly dismissed by most critics may be the confused form of their presentation, I prefer to go to the other extreme in summarizing and classifying all points for the sake of clarity :

1. The earliest editions of the « King's Book » have no prayers. These editions, moreover, are dated 1648 (that is, before March 25,

(1) *v. infra*, the study of the Editions, p. 37-40.

(2) Of Lord ANGLESEY, *v. supra*, p. 24.

1649, according to the present calendar). [It is well to remember in this connection that Milton was appointed secretary to the Council on the 15th of the same month, and assumed his duties on the 20th.]

2. Many later editions contain four prayers (others but three) said to have been used by the King in the time of his captivity. How were these introduced into the later editions, since the earlier had not contained them ?

3. It could only have been the Revolutionaries who inserted them later, because they alone possessed all the personal effects that the King had by him during his imprisonment. He delivered them into the hands of the Bishop of London, who was searched and all such objects were taken from him.

4. Among these personal effects there seem to have been three prayers. Various objects which had belonged to the King were shown to a certain gentlewoman, Mrs. Fotherly, who stated that she had seen three prayers among them.

5. Wagstaffe had in his possession when he wrote a signed letter from a physician, Dr. Gill, who stated that a former patient of his, one Henry Hill (Hills), « Oliver's Printer », had told him, from time to time in their familiar conversations, bits of the secret history of the Cromwellian period which he had never heard elsewhere. In particular, Hills had said that a certain Dugard, having been arrested for printing an edition of the *Eikon* (whose publication and circulation had been forbidden by the Commonwealth) (1), had been set free through the intervention of Milton, and permitted to continue his printing of the work on condition that he insert the four prayers (including, naturally, the « Pamela » prayer) in his edition.

6. Three of these four were probably such as the King had really used. It was more politic to insert a single one, which could later be « discovered » and castigated, than to invent all four (a procedure far more open to suspicion).

7. It is not known that the King was acquainted with Sidney's *Arcadia*, from which the « Pamela » prayer is adapted with slight change. The book is not on Sir Thomas Herbert's list of the works that the King had by him in prison.

8. On the other hand, as Wagstaffe says, it was well known to Milton. [It is on the list of the books in Milton's library (2), and is mentioned in two of his prose works (3). Moreover, the above-mentioned Dugard, the printer, later in 1649 bought a half-interest in the copy-right of this work. The entries in the Stationers' Register concerning

(1) *v. supra*, p. 21.

(2) HANFORD : « The Chronology of Milton's Studies, » *P. M. L. A.*, XXXVI (1921), p. 278.

(3) *Areopagitica* (*S. M.*, p. 740) ; *Apology* (*S. M.*, p. 783).

this transaction are dated Aug. 21 and Oct. 20 respectively (1), but it is quite possible that the book was much in his mind as early in the year as March.]

9. Wagstaffe had in his possession also two signed letters from another of Henry Hills's physicians, Dr. Francis Bernard, stating that Hills recollected hearing Milton and Bradshaw laughing together at the fraud perpetrated in the *Eikon*.

10. In the second of Dr. Bernard's letters, addressed to Dr. Goodall, Hills is quoted as saying that he remembered hearing Milton and Bradshaw say they had reprinted the entire book so as to have the « Pamela » prayer inserted.

11. According to still another signed statement in Wagstaffe's possession, from Norton, another of Royston's printers, Royston himself always suspected that while he was printing an edition of the *Eikon* in the early days of the Commonwealth, his employees had been tricked during his own absence into adding the prayers to it. And he suspected Milton to be the author of this fraud. So that when Charles II desired him to reprint the *Eikon*, Royston told Norton he was very glad that the King expressly stipulated that the prayers were not to be included. [Was it this edition of Royston's, the one he believed had been tampered with, that Dugard was caught printing ?]

Wagstaffe of course was a Royalist, and his statements cannot be accepted without confirmation from other sources. But such confirmation exists. His affirmation, that Bishop Juxon was thoroughly searched and perquisitions were made at his house corresponds to the texts of those orders of Parliament quoted above, showing that such was the habit of the Commonwealth government. Liljegren cites the order of Parliament for the Bishop's release the day after the King's execution, and other papers (2). The House of Commons Journal itself confirms the existence of all the more important of the small objects that Mrs. Fotherly says she saw, as well as the fact that these objects remained in the custody of the regicides (3). The House asked itself whether it ought not to return those relics to the late King's son, and having weighed the question for each one decided to keep them all (4). All this evidence is independent of Henry Hills's declarations.

In the last decade of the seventeenth century, all the evidence was

(1) LILJEGREN, *op. cit.*, p. 81.

(2) *Op. cit.*, p. 71.

(3) As proved by their enumeration in the sales lists of the King's effects (*op. cit.*, p. 73-75), as well as by the heading to the six prayers included in the first edition of the *Reliquiae Sacrae* (*op. cit.*, p. 45).

(4) *Loc. cit.*

already available (1). The controversy continued nevertheless throughout the eighteenth, Dr. Johnson, the Royalist, admitting the accusation against Milton (2), and Dr. Birch eventually rejecting it (3). During the nineteenth it fell into abeyance, although Wordsworth wrote on the question. It was essentially a religious and political quarrel, and one could have told in advance for each of the writers on which side he would be likely to take his stand.

III. LILJEGREN'S ARGUMENTS.

In 1918 the question was reopened by the appearance in print of the erudite work of S. B. Liljegren, on which I draw constantly. A foreigner (Professor Liljegren is a Swede) who had evidently no reason to have a *parti pris* (although he does seem to be especially impressed with some of the less admirable traits of Milton's character) Liljegren has minutely studied as many of the seventy-five editions of the *Eikon* as it is still possible to examine to-day and has made comparative tables which take account of every variation, including punctuation and misprints. After the publication of this work it might have been expected that the controversy would be considered closed and Liljegren's conclusions as to the facts in the case accepted. His exhaustive study appeared unassailable.

But a short article by a Scotch Miltonist, the late J. S. Smart (4), sought to cut the ground from under Liljegren's feet by impugning the veracity of Henry Hills. Liljegren's reply (5) to it was refused space in the review which had published Smart's article (6), and had to appear in a German one which is perhaps less read in England and the United States. At any rate, English and American critics have with very few exceptions adopted Smart's view and are to-day disposed to regard the question as settled in Milton's favour.

But Smart's article left many careful and weighty arguments untouched, and Liljegren replied only to the points Smart makes, without

(1) TOLAND, Milton's biographer, writing at the very end of the century, rejects it (not in the biography, but in a work entitled *Amyntor* quoted by LILJEGREN (*op. cit.*, p. 57) partly because of Hills's unreliability as a witness, partly because he confuses the functions of printer and publisher with regard to the *Eikon*.

(2) *Lives of the English Poets*, vol. I (« Everyman's Library, » No 770), London, Dent, pp. 68-69.

(3) LILJEGREN, *op. cit.*, pp. 64-65.

(4) « Milton and the King's Prayer, » *R. E. S.*, I, N° 4 (Oct., 1925), pp. 385-91.

(5) « Milton and the King's Prayer, » *Beiblatt*, XXXVII (1926), pp. 91-94.

(6) « The editor of the *R. E. S.* has refused to print this paper in his review. In his opinion it was too long. » (*Op. cit.*, p. 91, note 1). (LILJEGREN's reply occupies but four pages in the *Beiblatt*. I should not be surprised if the editor's real objection were to the tone of the article, which is not quite in the mild modern tradition of English literary controversy).,

repeating the mass of evidence produced in his work that Smart takes no account of. So it is necessary for the purposes of the present study to reopen the whole question again. I shall examine in detail first Liljegren's arguments, rearranging their order somewhat, and later the counter-arguments of his opponents.

1. Corroboration of Hills.

(I)

Hills states that Dugard was arrested in the act of printing an edition of the *Eikon*. Liljegren cannot present a complete substantiation of this, but he does show :

(a) that Dugard printed many editions of the « King's Book », his printer's emblems and ornaments being easily recognizable (1). Masson has already been quoted to the same purport (2) : « He [Royston] employed several different printing-presses, but chiefly those of a Mr. William Dugard. » (3)

(b) that in 1661, when trying to curry favour with the new King, Dugard expressly stated in an affidavit, defending himself for having concealed his former benefactor Sir James Harrington, in his house, that he had printed « the King's incomparable *Eikon*. » (4)

(c) that the Parliament Journal for March 16th, 1649, mentions an order for the arrest of an unnamed printer of the *Eikon* (5), and notes on the 17th that the order has been carried out.

(d) that the presumption is that this anonymous printer was Dugard, because he was the first and principal printer of the *Eikon*, and because he was « the most easily betrayed on account of his singular book-ornaments » (6).

(1) *Studies*, p. 81.

(2) *v. supra*, p. 21.

(3) IV, p. 148.

(4) This affidavit was published in Almack's bibliography of the *Eikon*, and is reproduced by LILJEGREN as follows (*Studies*, p. 46, note) : Wm. Dugard printed :

1. The King's incomparable Eikon Basiliké, which he received from Mr. SIMMONS, his Majesty's chaplain.

2. Elenchus Motuum Nuperorum in Anglia.

3. Salmasii Defensio Regia : for which he was cast into Newgate, his wife and six children turned out of doors, and had been tried for his life by an High Court of Injustice, had not Sir James HARRINGTON saved him from that danger, and procured his release ; and therefore in point of civility he thought he might entertain him for lodging in his house, being by the Act of Indemnity pardoned, as to life, and ready to render himself to his Majesty's pleasure whensoever his Majesty should so require it.

Ita testor,

GUIL. DU GARD ».

LILJEGREN adds in the same note : « A following document shows that this was written by Dugard in 1661 ».

(5) *Op. cit.*, p. 43.

(6) *Op. cit.*, p. 86.

(e) that after this episode of the arrest of a printer, the government no longer sought to suppress the *Eikon* (1).

(f) that Dugard was really in difficulties at about the time the unnamed printer was taken. There is a postscript to the affidavit above referred to, dated as of April 29, 1649, which reads :

I received a letter from Sir Edward Nicholas from the Hague, with approbation of my service in that condition and withal a book to print entitled *Stratosteliteutikoi*, which afterwards was printed, though I could not do it then, *in the time of my troubles*.

The last phrase, which I italicize, is important for this study. April 29 is not very long after that March 17th on which, according to the supposition of Liljegren, Dugard would have been arrested (that is, the day the Parliament Journal says that the order for the arrest of the unnamed printer was carried out) (2).

All these corroborative circumstances, then, tend to support belief in Hills's veracity. But Smart does not give these points any consideration (3).

(2)

Hills states further that Dugard was saved by the intervention of Milton. Here again there is no proof, but again the circumstances seem to coincide remarkably well with Hill's declaration. They never in any case appear to go against it.

(a) There appears to have been *some* intervention, because the order for the printer's arrest and the note of its execution in the pages of the Commons Journal are not followed by the mention of any penalty. Such mildness is contrary to the general attitude of Parliament. Clement Walker, for example, three weeks after the Council had ordered Milton to examine his papers (4), was sent to the Tower to await trial for high treason and stayed there until he died (5).

(b) Milton is known to have intervened in similar cases. « Whenever he could, however, he did use his influence in favour of such offending pamphleteers and their printers as could be brought to reason. » (6)

(i) *In the case of Needham*. In an Order of Council for Aug. 14, 1649, may be read :

That a warrant be issued out to the Keeper of Newgate for the appre-

(1) *v. infra*, p. 49.

(2) *v. supra*, p. 32.

(3) It is to be noted that « (e) » was inaccessible to Smart, since it was published in LILJEGREN'S subsequent reply to him. It is noted in this place as part of LILJEGREN'S corroboration of Hills.

(4) *v. supra*, p. 13, N° 10.

(5) MASSON, IV, p. 121.

(6) MASSON, IV, p. 156.

hending of Marchamont Needham, alias Pragmaticus, lately prisoner in Newgate, and now escaped (1).

And under the heading of Nov. 14 of the same year :

That a warrant be issued to the Keeper of Newgate for the discharge of Mr. Needham, the said Mr. Needham first taking the Test (2).

And under the heading of May 24, 1650, it is ordered :

That £ 100 per annum be paid by Mr. Frost quarterly unto Mr. Marchamont Needham, as a pension whereby he may be enabled to subsist whilst he endeavours the service of the Commonwealth, and this to be done for one year by way of probation... That £ 50 be paid unto Mr. Needham by Mr. Frost, as a gift unto him from this Council for his service already done to the Commonwealth (3).

Here are Masson's comments on these various orders :

This means that Needham, who had been released from Newgate six months before, *probably by Milton's intercession* (4), was willing after his two or three years of scurrilous journalism for the Royalists, to turn journalist for the Commonwealth (5).

Anthony Wood attributes Needham's release and reconciliation with the existing powers to Lenthall, who knew his family, and to Bradshaw ; but there can be little doubt, from the sequel, that Milton had interested himself in the versatile wit's behalf, and even visited him in Newgate to talk him into a better mind (6).

(ii) *In the case of Dugard himself.* Early in 1650, Dugard was arrested for printing an English edition of Salmasius's *Defensio Regia pro Carolo I* (which was to play such an important rôle in Milton's own life) and was dismissed from his school. There is an Order of the Council for Feb. 1, 1649-50 which reads :

That Mr. Dugard be committed prisoner to Newgate for printing scandalous and seditious pamphlets against the Parliament ; that his presses and implements for printings be seized by Joseph Hunscoth (the beadle of the Stationers' Company), and by him kept until the Council shall give further order therein ; that a letter be written unto the Company of Merchant Taylors of London to proceed to an election of a schoolmaster, Mr. Dugard being a man who hath shown himself an enemy to the State by printing scandalous and seditious pamphlets against the Parliament, and therefore do (*sic*) conceive him very unfit to have the charge of the education of youth (7).

(1) MASSON, IV, p. 146.

(2) MASSON, IV, pp. 149-150.

(3) MASSON, IV, p. 226.

(4) Italics mine.

(5) IV, p. 226.

(6) IV, p. 156.

(7) MASSON, IV, p. 152.

But when Milton's reply to Salmasius : *Johannis Miltoni, Angli, pro Populo Anglicano Defensio contra Claudii Salmasi Defensionem Regiam*, was entered in the Stationers' Registers on the last day of the same year, the printer who registered the book as his copyright was William Dugard ! (1) And Masson believes it was due to Milton's intercession :

The story, as it was told long afterwards, in Restoration times, by a person who had been Dugard's corrector of the press before his arrest, is that Dugard's wife had applied to Bradshaw for his release, that Bradshaw had said he would send to talk with him and see what could be done, that Milton accordingly went to Newgate and proposed terms to Dugard, that these were at first stoutly refused, but that afterwards the clever wife, Bradshaw, and Milton « juggled together », till poor Dugard had to yield. Legendary in particulars, the story is quite credible as to the main fact. The reconciliation to the Commonwealth of a scholarly man like Dugard must have seemed to Milton worth an effort. He had succeeded. Dugard, after a short imprisonment, had been released ; and now, with his press restored to him, and readmitted also to his mastership in Merchant Taylor's School, he was to be the respectable chief printer for the Commonwealth, employed on all printing work above the mark of Matthew Simmons. Instead of Salmasius's own book, he was printing Milton's answer to Salmasius (2).

It does not seem exaggerated to suppose that the instances just cited throw light upon the case of the unnamed printer who was arrested on the 17th of March, 1649, and apparently never punished. All this does not constitute a proof (and if we conclude that it was Dugard, we have to admit that he had backslid before November (3). But it should at least not be dismissed without some reply. Smart does not even mention these matters.

(3)

If we assume that the « unnamed printer » in question was let off, it would be out of line with such events to suppose that such clemency was distinterested. We have seen what was exacted in the cases of Needham and later Dugard : treason to party. There must in this case too have been a condition attached if immunity was granted. The testimony of Hills suggests what it may have been : that the new government required of the printer (whom Hills identifies as Dugard) that he add to an edition of the royal book the four prayers of which one was the work, or rather the artifice, of Milton. And Liljegren presents important evidence to sustain Hills's testimony on this point.

(1) MASSON, IV, p. 251.

(2) MASSON, IV, p. 252.

(3) This point is not raised by LILJEGREN.

According to his careful study of the first six editions of the *Eikon Basiliké*, all of them « undoubtedly printed by Dugard », it appears that the first four of them do not contain the prayers, while in the fifth and sixth they are added as an *appendix* (1). And in these last two editions the main body of the text, which is identical with that of the first four, is dated 1648 (that is, of course, before March 25, 1649). But the appendix, consisting of the four prayers (including the « Pamela » prayer) (2) bears the date 1649 that is, after March 25 of that year (3). Let us now recall the date on which a printer of the *Eikon* was arrested but not punished. It was the 17th of that same month of March.

Even if Smart had invalidated Hills's personal testimony as he is said to have done (4), he should have taken into account all these considerations which seem to support it. He says nothing whatever about them.

(4)

Hills further affirms, we remember, that the Puritans even went to the length of reprinting the entire *Eikon* in order to incorporate the « Arcadia » prayer in it. Again Liljegren finds external evidence which appears to corroborate Hills. He was quick to see the bearing on this question of the « mysterious entry » made and barred by Matthew Simmons in the Stationers' Register that so puzzled Masson (5). Simmons, printer to the Commonwealth, we recall, on March 16th, 1649, entered for his copyright an edition of the King's Book, that book that the government had done all it could to suppress. (This was the day before the date of the Parliament's order for the arrest of the unnamed printer, who was arrested the day after but was never punished, and who according to Liljegren's hypothesis was Dugard.) There is no proof that Simmons ever made any use of his copyright, but there is in existence an edition of the *Eikon* which corresponds exactly to the one Simmons might have made, if he had made one. It is No. 17 of Almack's bibliography (6), an edition bare of ornament, with nothing to betray the identity of its printer or publisher. It is the only

(1) LILJEGREN, *Studies*, p. 109.

(2) *Op. cit.*, p. 86.

(3) This is perhaps the place to give a list of the titles of the four prayers, in order to facilitate reference to them. They are, in the order in which they generally appear (*Op. cit.*, p. 86) :

1. A Prayer in time of Captivity (the « Pamela » prayer).

2. Another Prayer.

3. A Prayer and Confession in and for the times of Affliction.

4. A Prayer in times of imminent Danger. (*Op. cit.*, p. 85).

(4) *v. infra*, pp. 41-43, for a discussion of this question.

(5) *v. supra*, p. 22.

(6) *Op. cit.*, p. 100.

one of the editions dated 1648 which combines the *Eikon* and the four prayers into one work, and announces them on the main title-page of the book and in the table of contents. The others of that date that have the four prayers present them separately as an appendix at the end of the volume, with a new title-page.

Smart takes no account of all this either.

2. The Editions.

1. The edition No. 17 of Almack's list seems to be identical with the following item, No. 18, except for the presence of the prayers. They are lacking to No. 18. Almack himself remarks on this identity (1), but without recognizing the importance of it. But to Liljegren the meaning of it is clear : the Cromwellians were not in possession of a manuscript of the *Eikon* and were forced to copy some existent edition. But they had the prayers, and desired to incorporate them as completely as possible in an edition of the work. Such an edition had to be published in great haste, in order to bear the date 1648, which would seem to give it greater weight. This theory of Liljegren's is plausible. It creates at least a presumption. No other explanation of these facts has been offered. As for Smart, he does not say a word about them.

2. Liljegren's analysis of those forty-four editions of the *Eikon* published in 1648 and '49 which he was able to study (2) does not permit him to arrive at a definite conclusion as to the chronology of the publication of the four prayers, but he supplements it by a further comparative analysis of the three editions of the *Reliquiæ Sacræ Carolinæ* (3). This work, a collection of all the papers and writings of the dead King, was published at The Hague by the exiled court of Charles II, in order to follow up the success of the *Eikon*. The first of these editions, dated 1650, places *six* prayers after « The Papers Exchanged with Henderson at Newcastle » of 1646. Three of these prayers date from 1648 ; the three others are those same three which we find in certain editions of the *Eikon* together with the Pamela Prayer (4). But the Pamela prayer is not there. These six prayers are not placed in any special relation to the *Eikon*.

The *Reliquiæ Sacræ* is divided into two parts : « Civil Matters » and : « Sacred Matters ». The latter contains the *Eikon* and whatever

(1) LILJEGREN, *op. cit.*, p. 100.

(2) *Op. cit.*, p. 109-23.

(3) *Op. cit.*, Chap. X, pp. 124-39.

(4) *v. supra*, p. 36.

concerns the death of the King and subsequent related events ; the former touches only on events happening within the King's lifetime. The title-page of « Sacred Matters » is dated 1648 in the 1650 and 1651 editions of the *Reliquiæ* which indicates that the second part was finished before March 25th, 1649, and apparently set aside to await the completion of the first, together with which it was to appear.

From Liljegren's comparison of editions it becomes evident that the text of the *Eikon* found in this second part of the *Reliquiæ Sacrae* was printed not from a manuscript but from the first London edition of the *Eikon*, which, we remember, contains neither the Pamela prayer nor the three others usually found with it. Liljegren discovered proof of this important fact in the list of *errata* contained in the first London edition of the *Eikon Basiliké*. The 1650 edition of the *Reliquiæ Sacrae* displays in its version of the *Eikon* all the misprints of the first London edition as far as page 88. From page 88 on, the printer at The Hague has evidently taken note of the *errata*, since he makes not one more of the typographical errors which the list points out.

3. Another pertinent fact pointed out by Liljegren is that in the 1651 edition of the *Reliquiæ*, the three prayers (that is, « Another Prayer », the « Prayer and Confession in times of Affliction », and the « Prayer in times of imminent Danger », but without the « Pamela » prayer) are found as in the 1650 edition in a group of six in the first part : « Civil Matters. » But then in the second part (« Sacred Matters ») these three are printed *again*, this time *with* the « Pamela » prayer in a group of four (just as in that edition of the *Eikon* in which Milton made his « discovery »). The only possible explanation seems to be that the Hague editor of the *Reliquiæ* (Browne) had seen an English edition of the *Eikon* containing the four prayers, and in his zeal to put into his work all the literary remains of the late King, added them to the *Eikon* under the general heading of the second part : « Sacred Matters », quite forgetting that three of them were already to be found among the « Civil Matters », as of the 1650 edition.

4. Three conclusions impose themselves from this technical study of the editions of the *Eikon* and of the *Reliquiæ Sacrae* :

(a) The Royalist publisher at The Hague, Samuel Browne, had no manuscript of the *Eikon*. This is equivalent to saying that Charles II's court in Holland had none.

(b) Browne must have received from the court for his edition of the *Reliquiæ* a copy of the three royal prayers that accompany the « Pamela » prayer in those *Eikon* editions that have it ; these the publisher of the first clandestine edition of the *Eikon* had not, else he would have included them.

(c) The Royalists at The Hague, likewise, had not at the time of arranging the second part of their book : « Sacred Matters » (1648), the « Pamela » prayer, and knew nothing about it. Otherwise they must have included it in a work intended to be complete.

5. The heading for the group of six prayers in the first edition (1650) of the *Reliquiæ Sacræ*, runs as follows : « Diverse of His Majesty's Prayers ; whereof the Last Three, used by Him in the Time of His Restraint, were delivered to the Bishop of London at His Death, *from whom they were taken away by the Officers of the Army.* » (1) The last phrase, which I italicize, is not to be found in those London editions which carry the four prayers, i. e., the « Pamela » prayer, and the three others which are found among the six included in « Civil Matters » in the *Reliquiæ*.

« Taken away by the officers of the army » — we have already quoted the testimony of Mrs. Fotherly to the same effect, and the Orders of the Council which confirm a portion of it (2).

6. But a further question presents itself : How do the three prayers which Mrs. Fotherly says she saw in the hands of an officer, ever reach The Hague ? Here again Liljegren's study provides a valid hypothesis. He believes they were taken over, or sent over, by Colonel Thomlinson (3). Thomlinson was one of the two officers who guarded the King at the last, and was the one that won his friendship and trust (4) as completely as the other one, Colonel Hacker, incurred his detestation. It is then quite probable that it was Thomlinson who took charge of the royal objects and was required to search the princess (5) after her last visit to her father on the second day before his death. Liljegren believes that he had the objects bought in later, at the sale of the King's goods, in order to send them to the young Charles II, and that he sent the three prayers with them.

Liljegren's belief has the support of two facts :

(a) An entry in the Commons Journal (6) which shows that it was Colonel Thomlinson who turned the George over to the committee which had charge of the sale of the King's property (7), and that it was Widmor, the King's former servant who got it. (His unpaid servants, being among the creditors, sometimes received their back wages in kind.) (8). Liljegren believes Col. Thomlinson watched to see where

(1) *Op. cit.*, p. 135.

(2) *v. supra*, p. 28.

(3) LILJEGREN, *op. cit.*, p. 74-76.

(4) *Op. cit.*, p. 73. MASSON says (III, p. 723) that the King went on foot from St. James to Whitehall « with Bishop Juxon on his right hand, Colonel Thomlinson on his left ».

(5) MASSON, III, p. 174.

(6) LILJEGREN, *op. cit.*, p. 75.

(7) *Op. cit.*, pp. 73-74.

(8) *Op. cit.*, p. 75.

it went and bought it back, and that he carried it together with a copy of the three prayers (1) to the dead King's son at the Hague. This theory is supported by :

(b) The following letter of gratitude from King Charles II to Thomlinson's sister, Mrs. Twisden :

Mrs. Twisden : Having assurance of your readiness to performe what I desired of you by my letter of the 7th of February from Jersey, according to your Brother's promise in order to the conveying to me of the George and Seales left me by my blessed Father, I have againe employed this bearer (in whom I have very much confidence) to desire you to deliver the said George and Seales into his hand for me, assuring you, that as I shall have great reason thereby to acknowledge your own and your Brothers civilitys and good affections, in a particular soe deerly valued by me, soe I will not be wanting, when by God's blessing I shall be enabled, deservedly to recompence you both for soe acceptable a service done to.

Your loving friend,

CHARLES R. (2)

St-Johnston, 28 october, 1650.

Despite the gentleness and kindness of Colonel Thomlinson's character which softened the relation of jailor and prisoner as between him and the King, he was entirely of Cromwell's party and might have been expected at the time of the Restoration to share in the enmity which Charles II cherished against all his father's adversaries. Thomlinson had been a member of Parliament and of the Council of State ; he had been commissioner in Ireland under Henry Cromwell, and he was present at the reading of the King's sentence in 1649 (3). Yet he was not only pardoned by Charles II in contrast with the fate of every other revolutionist implicated in the death of Charles I save one (Colonel Richard Ingoldsby), but received signal favours from him in a form which indicates even gratitude on the part of the new sovereign.

Once again the hypothesis of Liljegren clears up all the difficulties and contradictions in the complicated situation. All the known facts can be coordinated with Hills's declaration, and with the conclusions which Liljegren draws. All is logical and clear. But if we try to follow Smart and reject Hills's explanation, we are left with a body of data on our hands which remains inexplicable. Smart makes no mention whatever of the *Reliquiæ Sacræ*, of Mrs. Fotherly's testimony nor of Colonel Thomlinson.

(1) « The leather case with the prayers and the two seals are impossible to trace in the lists, where only items of considerable value could be specified. » (*loc. cit.*).

(2) Quoted by LILJEGREN (*op. cit.*, p. 76) from John Evelyn's Journal (London, 1879, IV, p. 200).

(3) LILJEGREN, *op. cit.*, p. 76.

IV. THE ARGUMENTS OPPOSED.

The arguments opposed to Liljegren's theory group themselves around Smart's article, which sufficed to convince many. Bearing in mind the important points which Smart did not touch upon, let us analyze his article.

1. Smart's principal argument consists of an attack upon Henry Hills. His character study of the renegade printer is excellent. He shows that Hills was once in prison for adultery, that he could be an obsequious flatterer, and that at the time of his imprisonment he was obscure and deserted by his friends. Having as we know changed sides and become printer to the Commonwealth, he changed back again after the Restoration and became printer to the new King. In 1679 he is mentioned as one of the most zealous printers in the anti-papist crusade. He was twice accused of calumny : once in this anti-papist affair, and once with respect to a lady who obtained a judgement against him in the courts. Under James II, finding himself in danger, he saved himself by turning Roman Catholic and began to print « floods of tracts and Catholic sermons ». One of his adversaries, « without doubt an honest Catholic », says Smart, who mistrusted the recent convert, « did not hesitate to class him among the traitors ».

Smart considers moreover that the *tone* of Hills's « testimony » does not ring true, that it resembles by its wealth of detail and of startling circumstance the confessions made at the time of the Popish Plot, by perjurers who have remained celebrated to this day.

In his attack upon Hills's character in the attempt to undermine his evidence, we observe that Smart does not combat, nor even discuss, a single one of the *points* of Hills's statement, in spite of the external evidence which exists to corroborate them. He contents himself with recounting in telling fashion what was well known already (1) ; — that he was a renegade and perhaps a traitor — and adds that he was an adulterer, a scandal-monger, and at times a base flatterer, who was at the time of his condemnation in a difficult situation and abandoned by his friends.

It is a fact that during this troubled period traitors and renegades were numerous. Without wishing to defend them, we may remember the risks they ran if they did not change sides and that heroic characters are rather exceptional in all periods. A man may be much less than a hero and even a sorry rogue under the pressure of circum-

(1) Cf. the quotation from Dr. Birch's *Life of Milton* made by LILJEGREN, *op. cit.*, p. 64.

tances and yet not lie, for no object, in private conversation with his physician. Milton himself did not think it beneath him to induce a pamphleteer, Marchamont Needham (and perhaps Dugard also) to turn his political coat, and seems not to have despised them for changing sides. Needham even became Milton's intimate friend. John Phillips tells us : « His house also in Petty France, where all the time of his abode there, which was eight years... he was visited by persons of quality... all learned foreigners of note... and lastly, by particular friends that had a high esteem for him, viz. Mr. A. Marvel, young Lawrence... Mr. Marchamont Needham, the writer of *Politicus*... » (1) And Masson says : « Needham, who lived close to Milton in Westminster, had become, as Wood phrases it, a *great crony* of his » (2). It is evident that the fact of his being a political turncoat did not suffice to prevent amicable relations with John Milton, at least after the latter had become Secretary for Languages to the Council of the Commonwealth.

I admit that the undermining of Hills's reputation would be very important to the present problem if it were a law case and he had been subpoenaed as a witness. To destroy the character of the adversary's witnesses is a well-known procedure in the courtroom, and Smart convinces us that Hills would not have hesitated to bear false witness in his own interest. But in the situation in question Hills did not know that he was giving testimony, he was in no wise an interested party, he was merely recounting anecdotes to his physicians. Hills is not the witness in this case ; his physicians, with their signed and dated affidavits, are the witnesses. It does not seem to have occurred to either of these excellent men that their patient had been inventing tales against Milton. Hills, we remember, impressed one of them as being extraordinarily well-informed on the secret history of the revolutionary period, and it is exactly the man who knew how to turn his coat in time that might be the best informed.

I must now quote what Liljegren himself said in reply to Smart on this question of Hills's reliability. In the article alluded to (and refused by the *R.E.S.*) Liljegren says :

As regards Hills's story about Milton, Bradshaw and the prayer trick... there was evidently nothing for Hills to gain by lying. He apparently used to tell his physicians about his experiences during the Commonwealth. They made no use of these revelations till several years after his death. If he wished to slander the puritans in general, he might, when he was still living, have repeated some of the gross tales circulated about *e.g.* Crom-

(1) DARBISHIRE, *op. cit.*, p. 74.

(2) IV, p. 433.

well, with much more far-reaching effect. We can detect no reason why he should tell exactly this story in which he had to invent out-of-the-way details for himself (1).

2. Liljegren in his brief reply does not touch upon Smart's comparison of Hills's testimony with the perjuries of the Popish Plot, but on that point we have to recall that those perjurers were real witnesses, who knew that they were testifying in a court of law and had an interest in giving false witness.

3. In view of Hills's known character, how then, Smart asks, could such a man without influence ever have had occasion to meet any of the men in power, or Milton himself? Yet it is Smart who reminds us that after changing his opinions, or at least his party, Hills was printer to the Commonwealth. This would almost certainly have made him known to both Milton and Bradshaw. And if Milton could make an intimate friend of the renegade Needham, it is conceivable that he may at least have passed the time of day with Hills.

Liljegren in an interesting passage of his work (2) had already by anticipation answered this objection :

It is evident to anyone who takes the trouble to study the volumes of the Calendar of State Papers for these years, that the isolated and momentarily precarious situation of the revolutionaries surrounded by the mass of the people of England, Scotland and Ireland, had consolidated them almost into a fraternity for all that concerned external action. What one of them knew in such matters, they all knew.

And he reinforces his point in his reply to Smart : (3)

Mr. S. ignores that Hills was *Cromwell's printer* — not printer to the Commonwealth, as Mr. S. states — and that *Cromwell himself* wrote a letter to the Stationer's Company, in Aug., 1651, *in behalf of Hills* (*Minute Book of the Stationers' Company*). Hence Mr. S.'s opinion that Hills cannot possibly have been in the confidence of those in power, is obviously wrong. This is also the case with his supposition that so low a person as Hills could never have spoken to Milton. The fact is that Cromwell's Council of State later on appointed « his Highness's printer » Hen. Hills (together with John Field and the Master and Wardens of the Stationers' Company) to see to the strict enforcement of certain Press Acts. Here, Hills worked in exactly the same field as Milton and together with Milton's old comrade Marchamont Needham. To me, it does not seem possible that two men engaged on the same task, in the same period of time and under the same employers, can escape being thrown together rather often... In order to move the pity of his enemies and escape from prison, Hills tried to make believe that he was friendless and unprotected. Mr. S. believes

(1) *Milton and the King's Prayer*, p. 94.

(2) *Studies*, p. 135.

(3) Italics LILJEGREN'S.

this, but it was evidently not true, as even Cromwell exerted himself in Hills's favour (1).

4. There is in existence a manuscript of *one* of the three prayers that are always found accompanying the « Pamela » prayer. It is in the hand of the King, and it varies slightly from the form in which it appears in print. The prayer is evidently borrowed from *The Practice of Piety* by Bishop Bayley, which was dedicated to King Charles. Its ending in the manuscript bears a certain analogy to that of the « Pamela » prayer. Since the King borrowed a prayer from a bishop, says Smart, he may well have borrowed another somewhere else and have attached a similar ending to both the borrowed prayers.

To this I reply that it is one thing to borrow a prayer from a bishop and quite another to lift it out of a « vain and amatorious poem », as Milton himself calls *The Countess of Pembroke's Arcadia* in the *Apolo-gy for Smectymnuus* (2). It is indeed possible that it was the sight of this prayer borrowed by the King from the good bishop's work which gave Milton the idea of charging him with taking one from Sir Philip Sidney, and even that the form of the changed ending of the former may have been imitated by Milton in the adapted ending of the latter. But the *Arcadia*, as has been shown above, was not in the King's library and seems never to have made part of his familiar reading ; whereas the work was well known to Milton (3), and to Dugard (4).

We have no way of knowing whether Pamela's prayer would have made any particular appeal to the King if he had read it, but every reader of the poet must recognize that its first words were sure to strike a deep chord of response in Milton's heart : « O All-seeing Light ! »

5. Smart adds to this part of his discussion the surprising declaration that if Milton and his friends had done the trick imputed to them, they would have left the « Pamela » prayer intact ! I quote at length Liljegren's reply to this :

The second of Mr. Smart's arguments offers some rather curious points. He states that the Pamela prayer had been «lightly revised in the *Eikon*, so as to make it look like a Christian prayer. Why did Milton thus «blunt his own purpose » Mr. Smart asks.

I cannot quite catch Mr. S's meaning. As it was, the effect of Milton's « discovery » was strong, it actually caused indignation and alarm among the royalists, we have his own words for that in the second edition of *Eiko-*

(1) *Milton and the Kings Prayer*, p. 91, 93.

(2) *S. M.*, p. 783.

(3) He mentions it in the *Areopagitica* also (*S. M.*, p. 740) and it is noted in his « Commonplace Book » in his list of works read. (Hanford : « The Chronology of Milton's Private Studies, » *P. M. L. A.*, XXXVI (1921), p. 278.

(4) *v. supra*, p. 29-30.

noklastes... How, then, does Mr. S. know that Milton blunted his own purpose, when we have *evidence* that the poet achieved it to the full ?

Further, would *anybody* have believed Milton, if he had said that the King had prayed to a heathen god immediately before his death ?... The only thing possible was to charge him with having adapted a heathen prayer to Christian use.

Moreover, the original Pamela prayer ends like this : « Whatever become of me, preserve the vertuous Musidorus. » Mr. S.'s suggestion that Milton ought to have preserved this sentence, is rather funny...

Mr. Smart supposes that Milton was in such a hurry in his *Eikonoklastes* as not to perceive the difference between prayers *made by* and *used by* the King. Mr. S. evidently ignores the fact that *Eikonoklastes* was carefully revised by Milton — particularly the prayer passage — and published in a second edition. Of course, there was no hurry (1).

6. Smart discusses the question of Matthew Simmons and the entry for the copyright of the *Eikon*. If Simmons had really acted in collusion with the revolutionaries, he says, that famous entry in the Stationers' Register (2) would be merely analagous to the « blocking licenses » which Shakespeare's company used to employ against such as tried to pirate his works. They secured the protection of the copyright, but without intent to print.

To this I reply that with Milton and Cromwell we are in a different world. It is not in thinking of copyright acquired in the settled times of Queen Elizabeth to protect Shakespeare's works against a commercial wrong, that we shall understand the methods of the Roundheads in office. A troupe of actors in time of peace took a recognized legal method to avoid commercial injury. But a revolutionary government newly in power, which could arrest hostile pamphleteers and send them to the Tower (3), would hardly think of using a roundabout tradesman's method to frighten the printer of a work which no material means had succeeded in suppressing. Infringement or negligence of copyright presented no great dangers. Milton published several of his controversial works without copyright and incurred no penalty (4).

Liljegren retorts to Smart on this point thus :

No less absurd is Mr. S.'s reference to the « blocking licenses ». The latter were calculated to prevent other entries and the printing of the books in question. But the *Eikon* was long in print, when Symmons made his entry, and of course no unauthorised person would think of entering a book already confiscated by the regicides. In the case of the « blocking licenses », a private person (or persons) by means of the entry, asked the

(1) *Milton and the King's Prayer*, pp. 92-93.

(2) *v. supra*, p. 22.

(3) *v. supra*, p. 33.

(4) MASSON, III, p. 44.

authorities to allow no other persons to enter and print the book in question. In the case of the *Eikon*, it would have meant that the authorities asked *themselves* not to allow etc. Because the licensers were the regicides themselves. On the other hand, if Symmons was to print the *Eikon* for the government, he had to go through the formalities of an entry (1).

In this profound difference of opinion as between Liljegren and Smart, most Miltonists to-day are with Smart. To my surprise, I have not found in their works any analysis of Liljegren's contentions. They are satisfied to indicate in a few words their position at Smart's side. We subjoin the opinions of those critics who have expressed one on this question :

1. Saurat, the great French Miltonist, accepts the conclusions of Liljegren ; he quotes with approbation the « two historical studies characterised by solid erudition and a remarkable power of analysis, on *Milton and Galileo* and *Milton and the Pamela Prayer* » (2).

2. Hanford says :

« It was subsequently charged against Milton that he himself, in collaboration with Bradshaw, etc... and the reliability of this charge has been maintained in a recent study... The arguments of J.-S. Smart in *Milton and the King's Prayer* appear decisive against Liljegren's case (3). »

3. D. H. Stevens : a) « [Smart's article] Effectually destroys Liljegren's assumption of Milton's connivance. » (4) b) « [Liljegren's work is] Decisively criticised in... » (5)

4. E. E. Stoll :

« The mountain of argument raised by Liljegren to demonstrate the infernal perfidy of the *Eikon Basilike* affair is founded, as Mr. Smart, an Englishman, has shown, on the testimony of a man who in his own day was known to be a jailbird and a perjurer (6). »

5. E. W. Tillyard : « I omit the vexed question of Milton's responsibility for forging... J. S. Smart has done something to clear Milton of this charge. » (7)

6. Dora N. Raymond :

« In spite of his [Liljegren's] close study of many editions, his conclusion as to Milton's duplicity does not seem to me convincing...

(1) *Milton and the King's Prayer*, p. 92.

(2) *Milton : Man and Thinker*, Appendix B, p. 348.

(3) *Handbook* (1926), p. 81, note 19.

(4) *Reference Guide to Milton from 1800 to the Present Day*, University of Chicago Press, 1930, p. 182.

(5) *Op. cit.*, p. 242.

(6) *Certain Fallacies and Irrelevancies in the Literary Scholarship of the Day*, in *Poets and Playwrights*, Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press, 1930, p. 235.

(7) *Milton*. London, Chatto and Windus, 1930, p. 183, note 2.

The best defence of Milton in regard to Liljegren's charge is that of J. B. (*sic*) Smart (1). »

The only one of these critics who presents a longer treatment of this question is Mrs. Raymond. « The problem of authorship », she observes, « has been lately complicated by Liljegren's contention. » The phrase « lately complicated » betrays a slight petulance. The question was already open, as we have seen (2), before the close of the seventeenth century.

Let us consider her arguments :

1. « His argument [Liljegren's] rests largely on the testimony of Henry Hills, a renegade... » We have already observed that the testimony of this renegade is singularly confirmed by extraneous evidence which is not discussed by Smart : by Orders of Council, by Mrs. Fotherly, and by Liljegren's analysis of editions of the *Eikon Basiliké* and of the *Reliquiæ Sacræ Carolinæ*.

2. « Bishop Juxon did not disclaim the Pamela prayer even after the Restoration. » To this I reply that it would seem that after the Restoration Charles II had no desire to reopen the controversy concerning the plagiarised prayer. Such action would have exposed him to a renewal of the question of the authorship of the *Eikon* itself. The correspondence Gauden-Hyde (3) shows how jealously this latter secret was still guarded. In 1680, five years after Lord Anglesey learned from Charles II and the Duke of York that their father was not the author of the *Eikon*, when Royston, the printer, asked the King's permission to reprint the *Eikon*, Charles II expressly forbade him to include the four supplementary prayers (4).

3. « Another prayer was copied by the the King from *Practice of Piety*... Since the King made use of one prayer not his own, may he not have used another ? » I have already replied to this objection as presented by Smart (5). *The Practice of Piety* was a manual of devotion, dedicated to the King himself, which was very popular in the seventeenth century and many times reprinted. The *Arcadia* was no *Practice of Piety*, hence the scandal.

4. « If Milton or the Roundheads had indeed interpolated, would the interpolation not have been something more damaging to the King's reputation than this prayer ? » « More damaging ? » Mrs. Raymond asks a great deal. Masson says : (6) « This had been the strongest

(1) *Oliver's Secretary*. New York, Minton, Balch, 1932, p. 316.

(2) *v. supra*, p. 31.

(3) *v. supra*, p. 24-25.

(4) *v. supra*, p. 28.

(5) *o. supra*, p. 44.

(6) IV, p. 248.

popular hit in the *Eikonoklastes*, and there had been a great deal of remark upon it, with something like consternation among the royalists. »

To Milton, at least, and it is Milton's attitude we are studying, it would have looked like a very damaging accusation, as will appear from the following quotation from the work.

In praying, therefore, and in the outward work of devotion, this King we see hath not at all exceeded the worst of Kings before him. But herein the worst of Kings, professing Christianity, have by far exceeded him. They, for aught we know, have still prayed their own, or at least borrowed from fit authors (1). But this King, not content with that which, although in a thing so holy, is no holy theft, to attribute to his own making other men's whole prayers, hath as it were unhallowed and unchristened the very duty of prayer itself, by borrowing to a Christian use prayers offered to a heathen god... True it is, I looked rather to have found him gleaning out of books written purposely to help devotion. And if in likelihood he have borrowed much more out of prayer-books than out of pastorals, then are these painted feathers, that set him off so gay among the people, to be thought few or none of them his own. But if from his divines he have borrowed nothing, ...let them that now mourn for him as for Thammuz... remember and consider... that he that was once their Ahab, now their Josiah, though feigning outwardly to reverence churchmen, yet here hath so extremely set at nought both them and their praying faculty, that being at a loss himself what to pray in captivity, he consulted neither with the liturgy, nor with the directory, but neglecting the huge fardel of all their honeycomb devotions, went directly where he doubted not to find better praying to his mind with Pamela, in the Countess's Arcadia... (2)

Hark ye, prelates, is this your glorious mother of England, who, whenas Christ hath taught her to pray, thinks it not enough unless she add thereto the teaching of Antichrist ? How can we believe ye would refuse to take the stipend of Rome, when ye shame not to live upon the almsbasket of her prayers ?... shall we receive our prayers at the bounty of our wicked enemies, whose gifts are no gifts, but the instruments of our bane ? (3)

If Milton did not sincerely believe such a plagiarism as he imputed to the King was really damaging, he would hardly have laboured the point with so much eloquence.

Moreover, in seeking to throw a slur on the King's reputation, Milton had to stay within the realm of plausibility. The interpolation had not only to be plausible, but also it must not be out of keeping with the book in which it was to be included. In attacking the purity of the King's piety, so strikingly pictured in the frontispiece

(1) *v. supra*, p. 44.

(2) *Eikonoklastes*. (S. M., pp. 782-84).

(3) *Apology for Smectymnuus*. (S. M. p. 568).

to the *Eikon*, Milton struck hard and with great economy of means.

5. « Nothing could be *interpolated* without a *fresh edition* (1). It was the endeavour of the Roundheads rather to prevent than to increase circulation.» No doubt. But despite all the government's efforts at suppression, there were sixty editions of the *Eikon Basiliké* printed in 1648 and '49 (2). The Roundheads need not be afraid of one more, if it could contain an antidote to the rest.

Moreover, as Liljegren says in his reply to Smart : (3)

Mr. Smart even ignores the fact that *Hills himself* printed an edition (plus the prayers) of the *Eikon*... after Dugard (4) had been arrested and the book confiscated. There can be no doubt that the latter event changed the policy of the regicides regarding *Eikon Basiliké*. Dugard himself continued to print it and even dared to put his initials on the title-page, the book continued fairly to pour from the printing presses of the capital. This would have been impossible, had not the government changed their mind and encouraged the printers or left them alone. To get a book printed without the knowledge of the government was not very difficult, but if the men in power knew of its existence, they were quite able to stop it.

The words italicised above in Mrs. Raymond's phrase correspond exactly to Hills's declaration that there was a whole « fresh edition » printed (5), which seems to be so well substantiated by Liljegren's researches. Dugard must have « interpolated » the four prayers as an appendix to his fifth and sixth editions of the *Eikon* : while as for a « fresh edition », which should incorporate the prayers, and give them more weight than they could have as a mere appendix, Liljegren's arguments point clearly to the one for which Simmons took out copyright on March 16th, 1648-49 (6).

6. « Lord Anglesey, whose memorandum in his own copy states the book to have been composed by Gauden, wrote that when he saw the manuscript copy some of the alterations and corrections were in the King's hand. He claims that both Charles II and the Duke of York acknowledged to him Gauden's authorship. » What would have been important would be a manuscript of the « *Pamela* » prayer with corrections in the King's hand !

7. « It may be mentioned that he (Liljegren) is in error regarding Thomason's manuscript date on some of the pamphlets as being inva-

(1) Italics mine.

(2) According to Almack's bibliography, quoted by LILJEGREN, pp. 97-107 ; cf. also MASSON, IV, p. 129, note 1.

(3) *Milton and the King's Prayer*, p. 92.

(4) (Supposing it to have been Dugard).

(5) *ŷ supra*, p. 26, 36, N° 10.

(6) *ŷ supra*, p. 36. (Almack, N° 17).

riably the authentic date or publication. » Liljegren bases nothing of importance on Thomason's dates.

8. « Liljegren takes a very unfavourable view of Milton, believing him Caesarian and Machiavellian. This sometimes seems to influence his interpretation of facts. » (1)

In his judgment of Milton I do not follow Professor Liljegren. It is his erudition and documentation that seem to us valuable and uncontroversial, not his appreciation of poetry or his understanding of the human soul. His findings help to understand the transformation that had to take place before the creator of *Comus* could become the creator of *Satan*, but I do not feel that he adds to what others — notably Raleigh (2) and Tillyard (2) — have contributed to the spiritual comprehension of the poet Milton.

Without giving at this point another interpretation of Milton's character, let us merely ask ourselves here at the close of this chapter on the *Eikon*, whether Milton did or did not insert the « Pamela » prayer and himself fabricate the plagiarism that he attributed to the King. In view of the weight of evidence that Liljegren presents on this point, and the inadequacy of the arguments offered by his opponents, I think we are forced to conclude that he did.

But we need not on this account feel constrained to agree with Professor Liljegren that this proves Milton to have been either « Machiavellian » or « Caesarian » in character. What he did was not done from selfish motives, to gain wealth or power for himself. He did it for a cause which he believed with all his soul to be the cause of God (3). To his own moral judgement, since what he did was with the sole purpose of furthering that cause, his acts must have worn the aspect that the consequences of his sin eventually came to wear for Adam :

...full of doubt I stand,
Whether I should repent me now of sin
By mee done and occasiond, or rejoyce
Much more, that much more good thereof shall spring,
To God more glory, more good will to Men
From God.

But later, after the judgement passed against him by the event of the Restoration, doubts must have gathered thick upon him (4).

(1) *v. infra*, p. 71, n. (3).

(2) *Milton*, London, 1900 ; *Milton*, London, 1930.

(3) This distinction had great importance for Milton in making judgements of others. *Cf.* his defence of Gregory Nazianzus, *v. infra*, p. 77, note. And indeed it is essential in judging Milton's character, *v. infra*, *Conclusion*.

(4) « I cannot help thinking that Milton had come to regret the part he played in the Civil War. The desire for action had carried him away before he had learnt to know himself fully and to distrust the achievements of soldiers and politicians, however well-intentioned. » (Tillyard, *Milton*, p. 306).

Two things pertinent to the present study must however be noted :

1. The young Milton of the early poems never imagined that good may have its roots in evil. Good for him was absolute.

2. When Milton is writing as the spokesman of his party and fighting for the cause of God as he saw it, we cannot always believe him. Literal veracity at such moments for him takes second place (1).

Though not Machiavellian in character, he could on occasion, for the Great Cause, stoop to Machiavellian means.

■(1) v. *intra*. Chap. V, *Equivocations*.

CHAPTER III

THE CENSORSHIP.

We have had occasion already to refer to Marchamont Needham. Marchamont Needham (1) was twelve years younger than Milton. He was a graduate of Oxford. He began his career at twenty-three years of age by founding in August 1643 the *Mercurius Britannicus*. This journal, coarse and popular in tone, pleased the Londoners by its attacks against the King and the royalists. Having been thrown into prison (1645-46) (2) for this, Needham changed sides. He knelt in submission before the King, and from that moment until he changed back again, he wrote for the royalists.

His *Mercurius Pragmaticus*, the first number of which appeared in September 1647, was the contrary of *Britannicus* in its principles but employed the same methods of « ineffable ribaldry » (3). It was *Britannicus* which fastened upon Cromwell several of the grotesque nicknames : « Noll », « Copperface », « The Brewer », « Nose Almighty », which are a part of history.

This future friend of Milton's was arrested by the Roundhead government, June 18, 1649 (4), by order of Milton's friend Bradshaw. Five days later the Council ordered Milton to examine the *Pragmaticus* (5). Three months after that the Council gave order for the arrest of Needham, he having escaped in the meantime (6). He must have been taken again, since in November orders were given that he be

(1) MASSON, IV, p. 37-39, 146-56, 226-27, 324-35, 432-33.

(2) MASSON, IV, p. 38.

(3) *Loc. cit.*

(4) MASSON, IV, p. 89

(5) *cf. supra*, p. 13.

(6) MASSON, IV, p. 149.

set at liberty (1) ; but only after having sworn the « Test » oath (2). He had changed sides again.

Milton was no stranger to this latest reversal of Needham's principles. He had had long and important conversations with the witty scamp in his prison cell (3), and the future creator of the inflexible and incorruptible Abdiel (4) had succeeded so well in persuading a renegade to turn his coat for the second time, that by the following May there appeared the following Order of Council :

May 24th, 1650. That one hundred pounds per annum be paid by Mr. Frost quarterly unto Mr. Marchamont Needham... That £ 50 be paid unto Mr. Needham... for his service already done to the Commonwealth (5).

The pamphlet corresponding to the « service already done » was entitled : *The Case of the Commonwealth stated* (6). A very slight change of wording had sufficed to renovate for the occasion the title of his first royalist pamphlet : *The Case of the Kingdom of England Stated* (7) ; and similar economy of means served to transform his *Mercurius from Britannicus to Pragmaticus*, then from *Pragmaticus to Politicus*. It is difficult not to draw certain conclusions as to the superficiality of the alteration in his ideas.

Needham was very energetic. Barely three weeks later, on the 13th of June, 1650, there appeared the first number of his *Mercurius Politicus*, which soon became a veritable institution of administration, news and propaganda.

There had to be a censor to take charge of the new journal. The ideas of the Roundhead government on the freedom of the press were not such as are expressed in Milton's most famous prose work, yet when the Council had to appoint a censor to supervise Needham, their choice fell upon the author of *Areopagitica* ! (8)

It was an easy kind of censorship, which became, as Masson tells us, « a veritable collaboration ». « Milton was associated with him[Needham] as his censor, licenser and supervising editor ; » (9) the archives show from week to week that the numbers of *Mercurius Politicus* appeared « under the hand of Mr. Milton » (the technical expression by which was designated the licenser or censor) (10).

(1) MASSON, IV, p. 156.

(2) MASSON, IV, p. 150.

(3) MASSON, IV, p. 156.

(4) *P. L.*, 805, 896.

(5) MASSON, IV, p. 226.

(6) *Loc. cit.*

(7) MASSON, IV, p. 38.

(8) MASSON, IV, p. 324.

(9) MASSON, IV, p. 325.

(10) *Cf.* the allusion in Simmons's entry in the Stationers' Register, *v. supra*, p. 22.

This episode in Milton's life recalls certain famous paragraphs of the *Areopagitica*, published five years before, in which Milton condemns in advance the activities of which Masson gives us an imaginative glimpse :

One can imagine, through those months, Needham weekly visits to the invalid Milton in his Whitehall apartments, bringing the proofs of each forthcoming number of the *Mercurius* with him, and their consultations over the articles... (1)

I know not what should withhold me [says Milton] (2) from presenting ye with a fit instance wherein to show both that love of truth which ye eminently profess, and that uprightness of your judgement which is not wont to be partial to yourselves ; by judging over again that order which ye have ordained « to regulate printing ; that no book, pamphlet or paper shall be henceforth printed unless the same be first approved and licensed by such, or at least one of such, as shall be thereto appointed », ...Licensing books, which we thought had died... when the prelates expired, I shall now attend with such a homily, as shall lay before ye, first the inventors of it to be those whom ye will be loath to own [that is, the Inquisition]... Martin the Fifth, by his bull, not only prohibited, but was the first that excommunicated the reading of heretical books... Which course Leo the Tenth and his successors followed, until the Council of Trent and the Spanish Inquisition engendering together, brought forth or perfected those catalogues and expurging indexes... Nor did they stay in matters heretical, but any subject that was not to their palate, they either condemned in a prohibition, or had straight into the new purgatory of an index. To fill up the measure of encroachment, their last invention was to ordain that no book, pamphlets or paper should be printed (as if St. Peter had bequeathed the keys of the press also out of Paradise) unless it were approved and licensed under the hand of two or three glutton friars, For example :

« Let the chancellor Cini be pleased to see if in this present work be contained aught that may withstand the printing.

Vincent Rabatta, Vicar of Florence. »

« I have seen this present work, and find nothing athwart the Catholic faith and good manners ; in witness whereof I have given, etc.

Nicolo Cini, Chancellor of Florence. »

« Attending the precedent relation, it is allowed that this present work of Davanzati may be printed.

Vincent Rabatta, etc. »

« It may be printed, July 15.

Friar Simon Mompei d'Amelia, Chancellor of the Holy Office in Florence. »

[Compare this phraseology with that of the orders of the State Council which we have quoted, *v. supra*, pages, 13, 132. Nos. 4, 5, 8.]

« ...Vouchsafe to see another of their forms, the Roman stamp :

(1) MASSON, IV, p. 326.

(2) *Areopagitica: A Speech for the Liberty of Unlicensed Printing, to the Parliament of England* (1644). (*S. M.*, pp. 737-53).

« Imprimatur, if it seems good to the reverend master of the Holy Palace. »

Belcastro, Vicegerent.

« Imprimatur. »

« Friar Nicholo Rodolphi, Master of the Holy Palace. »

« Sometimes five imprimaturs are seen together, dialogue wise, in the piazza of one title-page, complimenting and ducking each other with their shaven reverences, whether the author, who stands by in perplexity at the foot of his epistle, shall to the press or to the sponge...

...Till then books were ever as freely admitted into the world as any other birth ; the issue of the brain was no more stifled than the issue of the womb : no envious Juno sat crosslegged over the nativity of any man's intellectual offspring ; but if it proved a monster, who denies but that it was justly burnt or sunk into the sea ? (1) But that a book, in worse condition than a peccant soul, should be to stand before a jury the judgement of Radamanth and his colleagues, ere it can pass the ferry backward into light, was never heard before, till that mysterious iniquity, provoked and troubled at the first entrance of reformation, sought out new limboes and new hells wherein they might include our books also within the number of their damned. » ... (2)

« Another reason, whereby to make it plain that this order will miss the end it seeks, consider by the quality that ought to be in every licenser. It cannot be denied, but that he who is made judge to sit upon the birth or death of books whether they may be wafted into this world or not, had need to be a man above the common measure, both studious, learned, and judicious ; there may be else no mean mistakes in the censure of what is passable or not ; which is also no mean injury. If he be of such worth as behoves him, there cannot be a more tedious and displeasing journeywork, a greater loss of time levied upon his head, than to be made the perpetual reader of unchosen books and pamphlets, oftentimes huge volumes. There is no book that is acceptable, unless at certain seasons ; but to be enjoined the reading of that at all times, and in a hand scarce legible, whereof three pages would not down at any time in the fairest print, is an imposition which I cannot believe how he that values time, and his own studies, or is but of a sensible nostril, should be able to endure. In this one thing I crave leave of the present licensers to be pardoned for so thinking : who doubtless took this office up, looking on it through their obedience to the Parliament, whose command perhaps made all things seem easy and unlaborious to them ; but that this short trial hath wearied them out already, their own expressions and excuses to them who make so many journeys to solicit their license, are testimony enough. Seeing therefore those, who now possess the employment by all evident signs wish themselves well rid of it, and that no man of worth, none that is not a plain unthrift of his own hours, is ever likely to succeed them, except he mean to put himself to the salary of a press corrector, we may easily foresee what kind of licensers we are to expect hereafter, either ignorant, imperious, and remiss or basely pecuniary. » (3)

(1) When the *Areopagitica* was published, in 1644, Milton's arguments had had such an effect on Mabbott, the censor, that he had given his *imprimatur* to every work presented to him, saying it was the affair of the government to prosecute *after* publication if at all. When taken to task, he invoked Milton's arguments in his own defence, but was none the less forced to resign. (MASSON, IV, p. 94, note 1 ; D. N. RAYMOND, *op. cit.*, p. 124.

(2) *S. M.*, p. 733-36.

(3) *S. M.*, p. 742.

Neither Masson nor the modern critics seem to have imagined what might be the effects on a pure and unworldly spirit of years of constant association with renegades and politicians. But although Milton's censorship was not so general and inclusive as what he describes in the *Areopagitica*, or as what Mabbott refused to do (1), still it is impossible that the forcing himself to a task so distasteful and so contrary to his cherished principles as the censorship which he exercised in such frequent and friendly association with this Needham thrice a renegade (2), should not have left some mark on Milton's spirit.

From the time of his secretaryship, there must be added to the single-minded personality of the young poet a second current based on astuteness, opportunism and a willingness to employ means which, whatever their success, cannot fail to affect the spiritual integrity of a man.

(1) *v. supra.* p. 55, note (1).

(2) MASSON, V, p. 671.

CHAPTER IV

THE EVOLUTION OF MILTON'S PROSE

Almost from the moment when he became Secretary for Foreign Languages, the tone of Milton's prose begins to change. This is not to say that there had not been coarse and angry phrases and passages before that. Even at Cambridge we see him at times in the « Prolusions » force himself to a voluntary grossness, which he perhaps mistook for humour, or resent fancied slights with ponderous bitterness. Later, in the *Animadversions*, he seems to have thought that coarseness would add point and weight to his arguments. Masson without daring to quote them outright, alludes to the heavy and disagreeable pleasantries concerning the Bishop's foot, his gout, his great toe and the odour of his socks (1). And in turning over the leaves of this work, the reader may find others for himself. But personal allusions are few. Coarseness is all, no cruelty or malice, no hatred. And few equivocations.

With the *Eikonoklastes*, Milton's reply to the King's Book, there begins a new series of his works — those written to order for the Council (2). As Masson says of it :

The antipathy... manifested to Charles throughout, is more direct, personal and savage than in the *Tenure of Kings and Magistrates*, as if the sentiment of Anti-Royalism had become more intense and rooted in Milton's nature (3).

But is that the real reason ? The change is almost too rapid. And

(1) III, p. 262 (*S. M.*, p. 503).

(2) *The Observations upon Ireland*, which he did not sign and which were but part of a more general report, scarcely count for this series.

(3) IV, p. 135.

it is very curious to see the manifestation of hatred increase after the death of its victim. (And that the death took place between the two works, Masson has no doubt) (1). Milton had spoken harshly in the first of a living tyrant ; in the second, he speaks savagely of the tyrant already in his grave.

This change corresponds to a change in Milton's life. The author of *The Tenure of Kings and Magistrates* was still the eager volunteer who wrote from his heart when a subject aroused his impassioned mind. The *Eikonoklastes* and the prose writings which followed it were the work of a professional under orders from the government, who for some months already when the *Eikonoklastes* appeared had been the close associate of men in office. He wanted to do what was expected of him. The cause was one he believed in with all his soul. But when it came to writing on one of the Council's set subjects, he forced the note. From the very fact that, being Milton, he was so different from the usual paid pamphleteer, in his very effort to attain their tone, he went beyond it. He knew very well that prose was not his natural form of expression, that when engaged in it he was limited, as he puts it, to the use of his « left hand » ; (2) and sometimes when he conceives it opportune to force himself to coarseness and invective, his work, instead of being recognisably the prose of the poet, like Shelley's, Sidney's or Francis Thompson's, becomes often the opposite of poetry.

That increase in ferocity to which Masson alludes as between *The Tenure of Kings and Magistrates* and *Eikonoklastes*, continues to manifest itself as between the *Eikonoklastes* and later works. When he speaks of the enemies of the sacred cause, nobility of soul is replaced by coarseness of thought and language.

To Milton's own taste, evidently, his coarse invective appeared humorous, as it did in his undergraduate days at Cambridge, when he tried heavily to be master of the revels with a Prolusion for the occasion (3). It has often been said that Milton lacked humour and it is evident that his laughter never came from the heart. It was always contemptuous, always derisive, and often marks a ferocious joy in the face of an enemy weakened and confounded. It lacked warmth

(1) IV, p. 64, note 1.

(2) *Reason of Church Government Urged against Prelaty* (S. M., p. 524). Already in *An Apology for Smectynnuus* (1642) he had said : « And if I were more warm than was meet in any passage of that book [*Animadversions*], which yet I do not yield, I might use therein the patronage of no worse an author than Gregory Nyssen, who mentioning his sharpness against Eunomius in the defense of his brother Basil, holds himself irreprovable in that « it was not for himself, but in the cause of his brother ; and in such cases, saith he, 'perhaps it is worthier pardon to be angry than to be cooler. » (S. M., p. 542-43).

(3) *Sportive Exercises on occasion are not inconsistent with Philosophical Studies*. (Tillyard, *Milton : Private Correspondence and Academic Exercises*, Cambridge, 1932, pp. 93-100).

and generosity and was always at somebody's expense (were it only his own foolish servant's) (1). We find this derisive laughter abundantly and increasingly in the prose of Milton's political period, and likewise in the great poems of his last years of total mastery and splendour. In them he attributes such laughter to God just as readily as to Satan.

But it is important to note that we find nothing at all of this order in the early poems of the young scholar-poet of Horton (with the sole exception of the anti-clerical tirade in *Lycidas*). In two quotations from Milton's earlier prose works we see his view of laughter and its uses as a controversial weapon :

1. Now that the confutant may also know as he desires what force of teaching there is sometimes in laughter ; I shall return him in short, that laughter, being one way of answering « a fool according to his folly », teaches two sorts of persons : first, the fool himself « not to be wise in his own conceit », as Solomon affirms ; which is certainly a great document to make an unwise man know himself. Next it teacheth the hearers, inasmuch as *scorn* is one of those punishments which belong to men carnally wise, which is oft in scripture declared ; for when such are punished, « the simple are thereby made wise », if Solomon's rule be true. And I would ask, to what end Elijah mocked the false prophets ? Was it to show his wit, or to fulfil his humour ?... And henceforward, if he can learn, [the confutant] may know as well what are the bounds and objects of *laughter* and *vehement reproof*. (*An Apology for Smectymnuus*, S.M., p. 554.)

2. And although in the serious uncasing of a grand imposture (for, to deal plainly with you, readers, prelacy is no better) there may be mixed here and there such a *grim laughter*, as may appear at the same time in an austere visage, it cannot be taxed of levity or insolence : for even this veil of laughing (as I could produce out of grave authors) hath oftentimes a strong and sinewy force in teaching and confuting ; nor can there be a more proper object of *indignation* and *scorn* together, than a false prophet taken in the greatest, dearest and most dangerous cheat, the cheat of souls : in the disclosing whereof, if it be harmful to be *angry*, and withal to cast a *lowering smile*, when the properest object calls for both, it will be long enough ere any be able to say, why *those two most rational faculties* of human intellect, anger and laughter, were first seated in the breast of man. (*Animadversions*, S.M., p. 479.)

He does not however make any great use of this weapon himself until he begins to write for the Commonwealth. Then he employs it at once, in the *Eikonoklastes* :

3. « Yet hardly it can be thought upon (though how sad a thing !) without some kind of *laughter* at the manner and solemn transaction of so gross a cozenage, that he, who had trampled over us so stately and so tragically, should leave the world at last so ridiculously in his exit, as to bequeathe

(1) Richardson's well-known anecdote. « *Explanatory Notes*, etc., » DARBISHIRE, *op. cit.*, p. 238).

among his deifying friends that stood about him, such a precious piece of mockery to be published by them, as must needs cover both his and their heads with shame, if they have any left. Certainly, they that will may now see at length how much they were deceived in him, and were ever like to be hereafter, who cared not, so near the minute of his death, to deceive his best and dearest friends with the trumpery of such a prayer (not more secretly than shamefully purloined ; yet given them as the royal issue of his own proper zeal: » (*Eikonoklastes*, *S.M.*, p. 783.)

In the Latin works, this union of « laughter and anger » is ever more apparent, as will be noted in the subjoined passages quoted. And there is equally apparent the increase of Milton's tendency towards grossness and invective as between the first and second *Defence of the English People*, and as between these two works taken together and the *Defensio pro se* which followed them. Compared to the mildly disagreeable allusions to the bishop's foot which Masson's delicacy forbade him to quote, the progress — or if one prefers, the descent — is marked. I apologise for the necessity of presenting herelengthy selections, chosen for reasons exactly opposite to those which usually prompt a writer to quote from Milton's prose. It is to be noted with what heavy and humourless insistence Milton repeats an idea which appeals to him as a serviceable weapon, such as that poor Saumaise was ruled by a masterful wife. Beginning with an allusion to gynaeocracy (1), he plays many variations on this theme : in the *First Defence* :

Thou art a very talkative ass thyself, and rid by a woman (2).

Such a little fellow as you, that are but one-half of a man, to run up and down with your mistress of a wife (3).

For what else should be in labour of, the wife of a woman, a he-wolf impregnated by a she-wolf... ? (4)

You are Elpenor, a miserable enchanted beast, a filthy swine, accustomed to a sordid slavery even under a woman (5).

But the attacks in the *Defensio secunda* become far more coarse :

Salmasius or Salmasia (for to which sex he belonged is a matter of uncertainty) (6).

He [Morus] had conceived a violent passion for the maidservant of his host and even after she was married to another, did not cease to solicit the gra-

(1) BOHN, I, p. 155 ; *P. W.*, p. 689.

(2) BOHN, I, p. 211. Tu asinus loquacissimus in sessus à fœmina. (*P. W.*, p. 705).

(3) BOHN, I, p. 159. Sapit, meherculè, sapit, teque oberrare semi-virum Gallum cum uxore viro. (*P. W.*, p. 690).

(4) BOHN, I, p. 166. Quid enim aliud uxor uxoris, lupus ex lupa gravidus, nisi aut portentum... parturire te oportebat ? (*P. W.*, p. 692).

(5) BOHN, I, p. 198. Sed Elpenor es, id est vile animal Circæum, porcus immundus, turpissima servitute etiam sub fœmina assuetus. (*P. W.*, p. 701).

(6) BOHN, I, p. 221. ...et Salmasius et Salmasia (uter enim horum is erat...). (*P. W.*, p. 708).

tification of his lust. The neighbors often observed them together in close converse under a shed in the garden. But you will say this might not refer to any criminal amours ; he might have conversed with her upon horticulture... He might have inserted a mulberry in a fig and thence might have raised a progeny of sycamores, a cooling bower ; and might then have taught the art of grafting to the fair (1).

...arrived in Holland, he went to pay his respects to Salmasius, where he immediately cast his libidinous looks on his wife's maid, whose name was Pontia, for the fellow's lust is always inflamed by cooks and waiting-maids ; hence he began to pay assiduous court to Salmasius, and, as often as he had opportunity, to Pontia... From this amour no common prodigy accrued ; for both man and woman suffered the pains of parturition : Pontia conceived a morill... Morus, the barren and windy egg, from which issued that flatulent cry of the royal blood. The sight of this egg, indeed, at first, caused our monarchymen, who were famishing in Belgium, to lick their chops ; but the shell was no sooner broken, than they loathed the addle and putrid contents... In the meantime, Salmasius, with the fate of Salmasia (for the fable is as appropriate as the name) little thinking that in More he had got an hermaphrodite associate, as incapable of parturition as of procreation, without knowing what he had begot for him in the house, fondles the fruit of his travail, the book in which he [Saumaise] was styled great (2).

« After this proæmium », the wonderful « Salmasius will make the trumpet blow a deadly blast ». You announce a new kind of harmony ; for to the terrors of that loud-sounding instrument no symphony bears so close a resemblance as that which is produced by accumulated flatulency. But I advise Salmasius not to raise the notes of this trumpet to too high a pitch ; for, the louder the tones, the more he will expose himself to a slap on the chops ; which, while both his cheeks will ring, will give a delightful flow to his well-proportioned melodies (3).

He [Morus] proceeds : « Indeed I have been in such habits of intimacy with persons of the first character in England... » I thought you had had acquaintance with none but bawds and whores... « My English friends readily prevailed upon me to suppress my name », and this was discreetly done ;

(1) BOHN, I, pp. 225-26. Hospitis ancillam quandam fortè adamaverat ; eam paulo post etiam alteri nuptam sectari non destitit ; tuguriolum quoddam intrare hortuli, solum cum sola, vicini sæpe animadverterant. Citra adulterium, inquis ; poterat enim quidvis aliud ; sanè quidem ; poterat confabulari, nimirum de re hortensi, prælectiones quasdam suas sciolæ fortasse fœminæ et audiendi cupidè expromere de hortis... liceret modo ficui morum inserere, complures indè sycomoros quam citissimè enasci, ambulationem amœnissimam ; modum deinde insitionis mulieri poterat monstrare. (P. W., p. 710).

(2) BOHN, I, pp. 226-27. In Hollandiam ut venit, ad salutandum Salmasium profectus, domi ejus in uxoris ancillam, cui Pontiæ nomen erat, oculos nequiter coniecit : semper enim in ancillis prolabitur libido hominis ; hinc summa assiduitate Salmasium cœpit colere, et quoties licuit Pontiam... Ex hoc demum congressu, mirum quiddam, et præter solitum naturæ prodigiosum accidit, ut et fœmina et mas etiam conciperet, Pontia quidem Morillum... Morus ovum hoc irritum et ventosum, ex quo tympanites iste clamor regii sanguinis prorupit. Quod quidem primo regis nostris in Belgio esurientibus pergrata admodum sorbitio fuit ; nunc rupto putamine, vitiosum ac putridum repertum aversantur. (P. W., p. 710).

(3) BOHN, I, p. 232. Post hæc proæmia, tubam terribilem inflabit... « ille Salmasius. » Salubritatem prædicis et concentus musici novum genus futurum : isti enim tubæ terribili, cum inflabitur, nulla aptior excogitari symphonia poterit, quam si affatim oppedetur. Buccam vero Salmasius nimis inflatam ne afferat moneo : quo enim attulerit inflatiorem, eo mihi crede, opportuniorem ad colaphos præbebit ; qui thumasi Salmasii rhythmicum hunc sonum, quo delectaris, buccis ambabus resonantibus, numerose reddent. (P. W., p. 712).

for they thus hoped to derive more advantage from the effrontery of your assertions, less harm from the profligacy of your character. They knew you well, they remembered your honest custody of the fruit in the garden ; and that, even when become a shorn and polished priest, you could not keep your hands off Pontia. And surely not without reason ; for if the word *carnifex* be derived *a conficienda carne*, why may not you, by doing for Pontia, from a priest become a Pontifex ? (1)

And you must remember, that when Salmasius was anxiously ruminating how he might re-establish his ruined character, and obliterate his shame, he was, by a certain retributive fatality, directed to you, who were not then officiating as a minister at Geneva, from which you had been expelled, but as worshipper of Priapus, of which lascivious rites you made his house the shrine (2).

And Milton even makes a slighting allusion to Morus's mother, of whom he certainly knew nothing whatever :

...you perchance may be the progeny of some frail heroine, for you are nothing but a compound of iniquity (3).

And yet this servant of Salmasius is said to have been an English-woman, and a staunch royalist ; so that you seem to have wooed her as a piece of royalty, and to have deserted her as the image of a republic, though you were the author of her degradation to that state of publicity, and, after having allured her from the service of Salmasius, reduced her to the condition of a public prostitute. In this manner, devotedly attached as you are to royalty, you are said to have founded many republics in one city, or to have undertaken the management of their concerns, after they have been founded by others... The fellow (shall I call him a man, or only the excrement of a man ?) next proceeding from his adulteries with servant-maids and scullions to the adulteration of the truth (4).

Here again you launch out into the praises of the great Salmasius ; great he certainly was, whom you employed as a sort of pimp, to procure his servant girl (5).

(1) BOHN, I, p. 244. Pergit in causis : « Equidem ea Anglorum melioris notæ consuetudine sum usus ». ...Putabam te mœchas tantummodo tuas et scorta... » Ut nomen meum premerem, facile impetrarunt Angli quibuscum consuevi. » Et astutè quidem illi : sic enim sperabant et se impudentia tua eo largiore fruturos, et te tua fama, etiam tum mala, eo minus causæ nociturum. Noverant enim te, et quam esses olim bonus hortorum custos, et nunc rاسus licet et pumicatus sacerdos, ut à Pontia ne Pilata quidem abstinere manus potueris ; nec de nihilo sanè, si enim à conficienda carne carnifex dictus putatur, cur minus tu conficiendo Pontiam Pontifex factus ex sacerdote tibi videare ? (P. W., pp. 715-16).

(2) BOHN, I, p. 251. Ex quo memineras Salmasium, fama jam deplorata atque perditam, cum dispiceret, qui existimationem afflictam atque obtritam, quoquo modo reparare quiret, te invenisse justo Dei judicio, non, unde excussus es, ministrum Genevensensem, sed episcopum Lampsacenum, id est, ex horto Priapum, suæ domûs constupratorem. (P. W., p. 718).

(3) BOHN, I, p. 251. Tu herois cujuspiam fortè filius per me sis licet ; totus enim noxa es. (P. W., p. 718).

(4) BOHN, I, p. 253. Et tamen erat illa Salmasii famula, Anglica, ut fertur, fœmina, regis partibus apprimè dedita ; nempe hoc erat, scelerate, adamasti ut rem regiam, reliquisti ut rem publicam, cujus tamen conversionis quam odisse adeo vis videri, vide ne ipse author fueris ; vide inquam ne subversa funditus dominatione Salmasiana Pontiam ipse in rem publicam converteris. Et hoc modo multas tu quidem una in urbe res publicas, regius licet, aut fundasse diceris aut ab aliis fundatas minister publicus administrare... Nunc quoniam iste (hominem an dicam hæreo, purgamentum potius hominis) ab ancillarum adulteriis, ad adulterandam omnem veritatem progressus... (P. W., p. 718).

(5) BOHN, I, p. 262. Hic rursum effundis te in laudem magni Salmasii ; Magnus sanè tibi fuit quem tu quasi pro lenone habuisti ancillæ suæ. (P. W., p. 721).

Vile wretch, would the people ever employ you to plead their cause, whose breath is steaming with the effluvia of venereal putrescence ? (1)

Later still, in 1655, with the publication of the *Defensio pro se*, Milton becomes still more violent and gross :

Again you say, I have « called Salmasius an eunuch », which I never have done. I only selected two verses from the prologue of Terence's *Eunuch*, as corresponding with the scenic exordium of the mourner, and that I might receive with a laugh what was lamentably ridiculous. You say « he was anything rather than an eunuch ». That is nothing to me. Take care, however, as you are alone, how you express yourself too confidently on this subject. Are you so totally ignorant of law, as not know, that you can scarcely prove anything without two witnesses ? (2)

As to your nights with Pontia, I know not whether they were Attic nights, or simply a Moreling dialogue ; some think the word spurious, others merely an embryo ; but persons of shrewder judgement are inclined to reckon it not of the number of your books, but of your children (3).

There is one Claudia Pelletta, the mistress of a married man, as hereafter we shall be permitted to call her ; whether you were the only married man concerned, is a point I cannot determine. This lady was a servant in the house of a gentleman of Geneva, a man of unblemished character, at the time you, who are notorious for your shameless manners, were a guest there ; and at this time she was common between you, the footman and the coachman (4).

O you fornicator, you high priest of bagnios ! who should have a buckle upon your inguinal region as well as upon your mouth (5).

It has often been pointed out before this, that Milton's works in Latin prose are far more offensive than those in English prose. But none of the critics seems to have taken into account a sort of chronological progression in Milton's verbal indelicacies which keeps pace with the increasing years of his secretaryship and might be explained by a hardening of his sensibilities and a coarsening of his fibre due to increasing familiarity with the under side of political action. There seems to the writer an evident progress in the matter in the three

(1) БОНН, I, p. 273. Tuane voce, impurissime, populus pro se utatur, cujus halitum ipsum oris tui venerea foetudine purus omnis aversaretur ? (P. W., p. 724).

(2) *The Works of John Milton*. New-York, Columbia University Press, 1933. Vol. IX, p. 61.

Ais me *Eunuchum* dixisse *Salmasium*, quod nunquam dixi : duos tantummodo versus ex *Eunuchi* Terentiani prologo desumpsi, ut Scenicum plorantis exordium, et lamentabile ridiculum risu, ut par erat, exciperem. *Nihil minus quam Eunuchum* fuisse affirmas : id meâ nihil refert. Tu tamen, quid hac in parte solus tam audacter pronuncies, cave. Adeone legum nescius ac rudis es, ut ullam rem difficilior probare te posse sine duobus testibus arbitreris ? (*Op. cit.*, pp. 60-62).

(3) *Op. cit.*, p. 129. ...nam Noctes tuas, nescio an Atticas cum Pontia, sive dialogum morillum, alii spurium, alii duntaxat embryonem, qui subtilius non inter libros, sed inter liberos tuos numerandum existimant. (*Op. cit.*, p. 128).

(4) *Op. cit.*, p. 135. Est Claudia Pelletta quædam, pellicem posthac nominemus licet, nescio an tuam solum ; quæ, cum ancilla in eadem domo honestissimi viri Genevensis esset, in qua tu hospes eras turpissimus, cum calone et rhedario communis tibi fuit. (*Op. cit.*, p. 134).

(5) *Op. cit.*, p. 143. O scortuum et ganeorum Antistes ! cujus non ori magis, quam inguini fibulam impositam oportuit. (*Op. cit.*, p. 142).

« Defences », which represent three successive years as Secretary for Foreign Languages. These Latin works are later than the controversial prose works in English, and thus mark a later stage in the demoralisation of Milton's taste and delicacy.

It is needless to insist in order to convince any reader of Milton that the young poet of *Lycidas* and *Comus* would have been incapable of writing what he has just read in the preceding pages. Nor yet the author of those prose polemics that were written before Milton's appointment to the secretaryship. Not even the author of the divorce pamphlets, which make up by the sincerity and dignity of the suffering they betray for their sometimes painful and disagreeable tone.

Milton himself felt the need of apologising for this habit of grossness of language that had grown upon him with the years of political life : He says in the *Pro se Defensio*, in which he went to the greatest extremes of coarse language :

But I come now to that which has given offense to the sanctified More, that prodigy of the age for chastity. « I employ (it seems) language of unwashed foulness, words naked and indelicate. » O shameful, prostituted man ! And do you censure words as foul, who without a blush can be guilty of deeds of unequalled foulness ? Indeed, it would not repent me now, had I been a little more liberal of my words of this kind, had it been only to elicit this scoundrelly dissimulation, and hence openly to expose you (masked as you are to the eyes of the world) as the worst of hypocrites ! But what expression, what word, will you point out to me, in any part of the book, more foul, than the word *Morus* itself ? Yet, it is neither in the word nor in the thing, but in yourself exists all vice and all obscenity. Lewder than any faun or naked satyr, your manners have converted words of chastest meaning into words of naked ribaldry. No shade could veil your filthiness, not even that notable fig-tree. Whoever speaks of you, and of your debaucheries, cannot choose but speak obscenely. And if I have uttered naked words in your reproach, I should be at no loss to defend myself by the practice of gravest authors ; who have always been of opinion, that words naked and plain, indignantly uttered, have a meaning far different from obscenity — that they express the utmost vehemence of reproof (1).

(1) *Op. cit.*, pp. 107-09.

Verum ad illud nunc venio quod virum sanctissimum et hujus ætatis longè castissimum offendit *Morum* ; *illoto* scilicet *sermone* *utor*, *verbis nudis et praelectastis*. Propudium hominis et prostibulum ! Tène illota verba reprehendere qui facta turpissima patrare non erubuisti ? Jam non pœnitere profecto, siquid in hoc genere liberius paulo dixissem ; etiamsi aliud inde nihil assequutus essem nisi ut elicerem ex te dissimulationem hanc improbissimam, tèque personatum omnibus vel hinc palam educerem hypocritarum omnium deterrium. Quod autem tu mihi dictum libro toto ostenderis, quod verbum illotius, quam hoc ipsum *Morus* ? sed non in verbo neque in re, sed in te vitium atque obscœnitas tota est. Te Fauno quovis aut nudo Satyro turpior, bona verba uti nuda essent tuis moribus efflecasti. Tuam nulla umbra, ne ficus ipsa quidem, velare turpi udinem potuit. Qui te dicit, tuâque flagitia, eum necesse est obscœna dicere. Itaque si in tuum opprobrium vel nuda verba exeruisssem, facile me etiam gravissimorum Authorum exemplo defendissem. Qui ita semper existimarunt, verba nuda atque exerta cum indignatione prolata, non obscœnitatem, sed gravissimæ reprehensionis vehementiam significare. (*Op. cit.*, pp. 106-08).

This defence reminds the reader of the *Pro se defensio* of Milton's retort to Morus, who had disclaimed for his part all tendency to mud-slinging :

You have no inclination, not you, « to play with mud » ; nor have you any desire « to dirty your hands with sending me back the garbage I flung at you. It gives you no pleasure to gain a victory over a barking cur »... And what is this, I beseech you, if it is not abuse ? hurled too, with all your might, at the moment you are affirming that you have laid it aside — thus rubbing your tail and snarling at the same time ; which very thing you likewise do while you deny it (1).

It is evident that the day of that appointment to the secretaryship, of his entry into party activities on an official footing, marks an important date in Milton's spiritual history. Up to that time he had indeed fought for his ideas with his pen, but only when the spirit moved him. After that time he was thoroughly a party man, not to say a party hack. *Qui veut la fin veut les moyens*. For Milton the test of the excellence of the means had come to be solely their expediency and their efficacy in view of the sacred end.

(1) *Op. cit.*, pp. 159-61, ...Nolle te scilicet luto ludere, nolle sordes mihi regerendo manus tuas cinguinare ; non placere tibi de cane latrante victoriam... Quid hæc quæso nisi convicia sunt ? quæ dum deponere te dicis, totis viribus intorques ; ita caudam atterere et simul ringare idem tibi est : idque ipsum agis, dum agere te negas. (*Op. cit.*, pp. 158-60).

CHAPTER V

EQUIVOCATIONS.

« Faction seldom leaves a man honest », said Dr. Johnson, « however it might find him » (1). It has been said above that Milton made little use of ferocity and equivocation in controversy before his nomination to the Latin secretaryship. Yet from the time he first took sides with his friends the « Smectymnuans » (2), he became at once the object of attack by their adversaries and immediately felt the necessity of presenting himself, in his new character of defender of the party, as a personage impeccable and unassailable and one who had always been such.

All the biographers have naturally made great use of the autobiographical passages in the prose works. But let us not take them without a grain of salt. As soon as he felt himself to be recognized as a defender of the party, even as early as the *Apology for Smectymnuus* (3) in answering the first direct attacks against himself, these autobiographical passages became not only the defence of his personal pride (known to all the world as immense) but practically also of propaganda for his side in the various disputes. He considers himself more and more as a standard-bearer and the voice of his party ; the defender must himself be above question in all respects. He partly makes himself over in retrospect into the stainless personage ideally suitable to be the champion of God's cause (4). As early as 1642 he wrote (5) :

(1) *Op. cit.*, p. 68,

(2) MASSON, II, pp. 214-20, 253-60. Milton's first pamphlet in their defence was *Animadversions upon the Remonstrant's Defence against Smectymnuus* (1641). (*S. M.*, pp. 478-504).

(3) *An Apology against a Pamphlet call' d A Modest Confutation of the Animadversions of the Remonstrant against Smectymnuus* (1642) v. MASSON, II, pp. 398-408. (*S. M.*, pp. 530-573).

(4) « His real reply to criticism actual or imagined, was the elaboration of an ideal conception of his personality. » (HANFORD, *Creative Personality : The Case of John Milton*. *Johns Hopkins Magazine*, XV (June, 1927), p. 336.

(5) In the *Apology* (*S. M.*, p. 542).

But when I discerned his intent [of his adversary] was not so much to smite at me, *as through me to render odious the truth which I had written*, and so stain with ignominy that evangelic doctrine which opposes the tradition of prelaty, *I conceived myself to be now not as mine own person*, but as a member incorporate into that truth whereof I was persuaded, and whereof I had declared openly to be a partaker. Whereupon I thought it my duty, if not to myself, yet to the religious cause I had in hand, not to leave the least spot or blemish in good name, so long as God should give me to say that which might wipe it off (1).

From then on we cannot take Milton literally without checking the facts. Even when we find them as stated, we perceive sometimes that their forms and colours have been modified so as to alter their meaning.

The word « equivocation » is used in this chapter in a large sense, as applicable to any phraseology intended to give a more or less disguised aspect to the truth and reaching at times as far as misstatement. It often consists merely of presenting a half-truth. For the Puritans, according to Maitland, truth and lies might often be judged according to the motives of the speaker :

For the history of the Reformation in England, we depend so much on the testimony of writers, who may be considered as belonging or more or less attached, to the puritan party, — or who obtained their information from persons of that sect, — that it is of the utmost importance to inquire whether there was anything in their notions respecting *truth*, which ought to throw suspicion on any of their statements.

The question is one which does not require much research or argument. There is something very frank (one is almost inclined to say : honest) in the avowals, either direct or indirect, which various Puritans have left on record, that it was considered not only allowable, but meritorious to tell lies for the sake of the good cause in which they were engaged, and for the benefit of those who were fellow-helpers in it. The case is not merely that the charitable partisan looked with compassion on the weak brother who denied his faith under the dread of cruel torments, or stood by with pitying and loving connivance while he told a lie as to some matter of fact, to save his own life, or lives dearer than his own. It is, that they did not hesitate, without any such urgent temptation, and *with great deliberation and solemnity*, to state what they knew to be false ; and that the manner in which such falsehoods were avowed by those told them, and recorded by their friends and admirers, is sufficient evidence that such a practice was not considered discreditable (2).

It must not be forgotten that Maitland was speaking of the Reformation period ; but the Roundheads were not dissimilar to their predecessors, and this judgement is equally applicable to Cromwell

(1) Italics mine.

(2) S. B. MAITLAND, *Essays on Subjects connected with the Reformation in England*, London, Rivington, 1849, Essay I : *Puritan Veracity*, pp. 1-2.

and his followers. And Milton was certainly no stranger to all the nuances of equivocation in dealing with his public (1). His curious analysis of truth and justice in the last chapter of *Eikonoklastes* (2) almost implies a pragmatic test of truth in action, and in *The Christian Doctrine* he boldly justifies a very large manipulation of the truth in the interests of what he considers worthy motives : (3)

Veracity consists in speaking the truth to all who are entitled to hear it... and in matters which concern the good of our neighbor (4)... for it is not every concealment of the truth that is wrong, inasmuch as we are not on occasions required to declare what we know ; that concealment only is blameable, which proceeds from improper motives... (5)

Since however not only the dissimulation or concealment of truth, but even direct untruth with the intention of deceiving, may in many instances be beneficial to our neighbor, it will be necessary to define falsehood somewhat more precisely ; for I see no reason why the same rule should not apply to this subject, which holds good with regard to homicide, and other cases hereafter to be mentioned, our judgement of which is formed not so much from the actions themselves, as from the intention in which they originated... If I am under no obligation to restore to a madman a sword, or any other deposit, committed to me while in a sound mind, why should I be required to render the truth to one from whom I never received it, and who will in all probability make a bad use of it ?... (6)

Hence falsehood may perhaps be defined as follows : *Falsehood* is inferred when *any one, from a dishonest motive, either perverts the truth, or utters what is false to one to whom it is his duty to speak truth...* (7) It is better therefore to say that... where we are not under an obligation to speak the truth, there can be no reason why we should not, when occasion requires it, utter even what is false ; nor do I perceive why this should be more allowable in war than in peace, especially in cases where, by an honest and beneficial kind of falsehood, we may be enabled to avert injury or danger from ourselves or our neighbor (8)...

(1) « He [Milton] may suppress a large measure of the truth, but we need not therefore conclude that what he did say was a mass of lies. » (Tillyard, *Milton*, p. 110). Certainly not, yet a half-truth may give an entirely false impression.

(2) *S. M.*, p. 857.

(3) *The Christian Doctrine*, Chap. XIII. (*S. M.*, pp. 1067-69. BOHN, V, pp. 114-17).

(4) *The Works of John Milton*, Columbia University Press, Vol. XVII, (1934), p. 296 : *Veracitas est qua ei cui æquum est, et quibus de rebus convenit, ad bonum proximi, vera dicimus.* »

(5) *Ibid.* « ...nam omnis non improbat : non enim semper vera palam expromere necesse habemus ; ea tantum reprehenditur quæ malitiosa est.

(6) *Op. cit.*, p. 298 : Sed quoniam sæpe usu venit ut non solum vera dissimulare aut reticere, sed etiam fallendi animo falsa dicere utile ac salutare proximo sit, danda opera est, ut mendacium quid sit melius definiamus. Neque enim video cur non idem de mendacio quod de homicidio aliisque rebus, de quibus infra dicetur, nunc dici posset, quæ non tam facto quam obiecto et fine agendi ponderanda sunt... Certe si gladium, aliamve rem quam apud me sanus deposuerit, eidem furenti non reddiderim, cur veritatem non depositam, ei ad quem veritas minime pertineat, male usuro expromam ?

(7) *Op. cit.*, p. 300 : Quid si igitur mendacium hoc modo definiamus ? Mendacium est cum quis dolo malo aut veritatem depravat, aut falsum dicit ei, quicunque is sit, cui dicere veritatem ex officio debuerat.

(8) *Op. cit.*, p. 302 : ...eo quod si quis est cui verum dicere officii nostri non sit, nihil certe interest an illi quoties expedit etiam falsum dicamus : nec video cur hoc in bello magis quam in pace liceat, præsertim quoties iniuriam aut periculum a nobismetipsis aut a proximo salutari et probo quodam mendacii depellere licet.

...we are undoubtedly commanded to speak the truth ; but to whom ? not to an enemy, not to a madman, not to an oppressor, not to an assassin, but to our neighbor... If then it is to our neighbor only that we are commanded to speak the truth, it is evident that we are not forbidden to utter what is false, if requisite, to such as do not deserve that name (1).

This doctrine, evidently, goes far beyond that « misleading suppression of a part of his full mind » which Hanford recognizes as characteristic of what he calls « Miltonic strategy » and of which he finds traces already in the young Milton (2). As the *Christian Doctrine* was finished probably late in Milton's life (3), at any rate after the period of political activity, and as these quotations are taken from one of the latest chapters, is it not possible to believe that this chapter was in part a piece of self-justification ?

Liljegren presents a series of instances in which Milton seems to make a relative use of the truth. To these I add various observations and bring some supporting evidence.

I.

MILTON'S REFUSAL TO ENTER THE CHURCH.

It had always been understood in Milton's family and circle of friends that he was destined to be a clergyman. As he puts it himself : « ...The Church, to whose service, by the intention of my parents and friends I was destined of a child, and in mine own resolutions. » (4) It was doubtless with this end in view that his father had given him such an excellent education and had done everything to encourage the talents of his predestined son. But arrived at manhood, on leaving the university with his two degrees of B.A. and M.A., Milton settled down into a life of studious leisure at his father's house at Horton, apparently abandoning his intention to take orders.

At about this time, Milton himself offered two explanations of his new resolution, one in an English letter to a friend (5) not defini-

(1) *Op. cit.*, p. 304 : His atque aliis huiusmodi locis veritatem dicere, iubemur : at cui ? non hosti, non furioso, non violento, non sicario ; sed proximo, quicum scilicet pax et iusta societas nobis intercedit. Iam vero si veritatem soli proximo dicere iubemur, profecto iis qui nomen proximi non mercentur, ne falsum quidem quoties opus est dicere vetamur.

(2) *v. infra*, pp. 70-71, for the full quotation.

(3) HANFORD, « The Date of Milton's *De doctrina christiana*, » *S. P.*, XVII (1920), pp. 310, 317-18.

(4) *Reason of Church Government* (*S. M.*, p. 527). But in the *Second Defence* he says it was to literature he was destined : « Pater me puerulum humaniorum literarum studiis destinavit ». (*P. W.*, p. 719 ; BOHN, I, p. 254).

(5) W. R. PARKER believes it was Thomas Young ; *v.* his article : *Milton's Unknown Friend*, *Times Lit. Suppl.*, May 16, 1936, p. 420.

tely identified (1) and the other in an epistle in Latin verse addressed to his father (2). The two explanations have little in common. In the English letter the young scholar-poet says that he is not mature enough and implies that his decision is merely retarded. But in the Latin epistle he announced his firm desire to consecrate his life and his talent to the Muses. Hanford has observed this disparity and has analysed it at length in a few paragraphs which it will be well to quote in full : (3)

This friend (whom we may assume to have been a divine) had evidently warned Milton that the hours of the day were passing and had suggested that he was allowing his love of study to become a form of idleness and self-indulgence. In reply, Milton admits that study as a mere gratification of curiosity is not praiseworthy, but he feels assured that this weakness cannot be ascribed to him. The love of learning alone, he says, would not suffice to weigh against the motives which would naturally urge him toward an active life. These motives he analyses with characteristic thoroughness : they are the need of providing for a family and home ; the desire of fame ; the consciousness that God demands our employment of the talent which is lodged in us. (4) His real reason, he concludes, viewing the matter quite objectively, is precisely that he may more thoroughly prepare himself to render up a true account. He is, he adds, inclined to this course because he has noted a certain belatedness in himself, as recorded in the sonnet written on the occasion of his twenty-third birthday. (5) The sonnet is included in the letter and indeed the prose composition has somewhat the air of an artistic setting for the poetical gem...

It is odd but characteristic that Milton should, in this statement, say nothing whatever regarding his literary purposes and ambitions. No reader previously unacquainted with his thoughts on this subject could possibly infer them from the letter, the plain implication of the language being that he intends, when he is ready, to labour in the vineyard as a minister. It is possible, of course, that in the suggestion about a congregation and preaching Milton was maintaining a mental reservation, having already determined to interpret his ministry in terms of the poetic enunciation of divine truth. More probably he had not yet altogether abandoned the plan of entering the church. In any case there is a *misleading suppression of a part of his full mind, which we may regard as a characteristic manifestation of Miltonic strategy...* (6)

(1) MASSON, I, 289-92.

(2) *Ad patrem* (S. M., 139-41).

(3) *The Youth of Milton*, p. 129-131.

(4) And that one Talent which is death to hide, Lodg'd with me useless. (*Sonnet XIX*, S. M., p. 35-6).

(5) My lasting days fly on with full career,
But my late spring no bud or blossom shew'th
And inward ripeness doth much less appear

That some more timely-happy spirits indu'th. (*Sonnet VII*, 5-4, 7-8).

But cf. W. R. PARKER, *Some Problems in the Chronology of Milton's Early Poems*, R. E. S., XI, pp. 276-83. Parker argues that this sonnet marks Milton's 24th birthday, thus indicating an even greater retardation.

(6) Italics mine.

The charming Latin epistle *Ad Patrem* was probably written contemporaneously with the English letter at the beginning of the Horton period (1), and it should be set beside the latter statement as completing the representation of Milton's point of view at this time. The contrast between the two is striking. In the Latin epistle Milton surrenders himself entirely to his enthusiasm for self-cultivation and creative art. We hear nothing of his intention to enter the church, nothing of the need of rendering account of the « one talent which 'tis death to hide. » Milton extolls poetry as a worthy object of highest endeavour... and he appeals to his father... to continue to indulge the son in his pursuit of knowledge and in his conception of himself as *a part though the humblest of the gifted throng* (2).

We find thus that even before his entry into political life, Milton had a tendency, in a mild form, to give two explanations of the same act. But while his youthful reasons were personal, in his political writings he always chooses to exhibit the noble public reason.

Liljegren does not believe in either of these early reasons, and makes use of this occasion to set forth his theory of Milton's « Caesarism », saying that the poet was absorbed by the ambition to become famous and that poetry was for him merely one of several means to that end (3). But this is hard to accept in the face of the mass of evidence to the contrary scattered through the works of Milton from beginning to end. He had always had at once the ambition and the certitude of becoming a great poet. He tells us himself that he had this from his earliest years (4). Hanford offers us (5) a list of seven passages in which Milton shows his preoccupation with the idea of composing an epic poem, without counting the further proof contained in the Cambridge manuscript.

We add two further quotations from the year 1641, which likewise show Milton's « hope to write well hereafter in laudable things » :

But much latelier in the private academies of Italy... I began thus far to assent both to them and divers of my friends here at home, and not less to *an inward prompting which now grew daily upon me* (6), that by

(1) TILLYARD does not agree with HANFORD as to the date of the epistle; cf. *Milton*, Appendix D, p. 384. But for our present problem the question of date is indifferent.

(2) Italics mine.

(3) « Er wird tatsächlich nicht öffentlicher Poet, nachdem er die Kirche aufgegeben hatte, sondern er versucht alles, was ihn berühmt machen können; er versucht sich als Historischer, als Pädagog... als Pamphletist, gewissermassen als Religionsstifter, als Politiker, als Theologe ». (*Miltons Wahl des Berufs*, Beiblatt, XXXV (1924), p. 159. (This is also Mutschmann's thesis in *Der andere Milton*, BONN, 1920). v. Liljegren, *Studies*, pp. XVII-XVIII, XXIX-XLII.

(4) Nam cum ab adolescentulo humanioribus studiis, ut qui maxime deditus. « (*Defensio Secunda*, P. W. 930). « I must say, therefore, that after I had for my first years, by the ceaseless diligence and care of my father (whom God recompense!) been exercised to the tongues, and some sciences, as my age would suffer, by sundry masters and teachers, both at home and at the schools, it was found that whether aught was imposed me by them that had the overlooking, or betaken to of mine own choice in English, or other tongue, prosing or versing, but chiefly this latter, the style, by certain vital signs it had, was likely to live. » (*Reason of Church Government*, S. M., p. 524).

(5) HANDBOOK, p. 141-46.

(6) Italics mine.

labour and intense study (which I take to be my portion in this life), joined with the strong propensity of nature, I might perhaps leave something so written to aftertimes, as they should not willingly let it die. » (1)

Then, amidst the hymns and hallelujahs of saints, someone may perhaps be heard offering at high strains in new and lofty measures to sing and celebrate thy divine mercies and marvellous judgments in this land throughout all ages. » (2).

And he that now for haste snatches up a plain ungarnished present as a thank-offering to thee, which could not be deferred with regard of thy so many late deliverances wrought for us one upon another, may then perhaps take up a harp and sing thee an elaborate song to generations. (3)

Milton's stay in his father's home, in the tranquil village of Horton in Buckinghamshire lasted more than five years — from July 1632 to April 1638 (4) — and the two youthful explanations of his refusal to become a clergyman are of this period. Four years later, however, Milton gave a third explanation to the public, which resembled neither of the others.

In *The Reason of Church Government urged against Prelaty*, his fourth pamphlet, published in February 1642, in which he introduces himself as the mouthpiece of the Anti-Anglican Party, he gives thus the reasons of his refusal :

But were it the meanest under-service, if God by his secretary conscience enjoin it, it were sad for me if I should draw back ; for me especially, now when all men offer their aid to help ease and lighten the difficult labours of the church, to whose service, by the intentions of my parents and friends, I was destined of a child, and in mine own resolutions : till coming to some maturity of years, and perceiving what tyranny had invaded the church, that he who would take orders must subscribe slave, and take an oath withal, which, unless he took with a conscience that would stretch, he must either straight perjure, or split his faith ; I thought it better to prefer a blameless silence before the sacred office of speaking, bought and begun with servitude and foreswearing. (5)

The fault now lies, it seems, with the clergy. Milton states it in a phrase which has become celebrated : « thus church-outed by the prelates. » (6)

We know that in his youth he was well aware of serious defects in his classmates who were studying divinity, from the letter he wrote from Cambridge to his former teacher, Alexander Gill :

(1) *Reason of Church Government*, S. M., p. 524.

(2) *Of Reformation* (S. M. p. 469).

(3) *Animadversions upon the Remonstrant's Defense against Smectymnus*, S. M., p. 479.

(4) MASSON, I, p. 552.

(5) S. M., p. 527.

(6) *Loc. cit.*

At any rate, as far as I know, there are but one or two among us who do not take their flight to theology before ever they are fledged, almost untrained and uninitiated in literature alike. And even of theology they are content with a mere smattering, if it be but enough to enable them to piece together after a fashion some little homily and patch it up as it were out of scraps of other men's rags. So much so, that there is a serious risk of our clergy gradually falling into the popish ignorance of former ages (1).

Later, at the time of *Lycidas*, he was angry against many of the clergy and thought them unworthy of their charge (2). But there is no word of that « tyranny that had invaded the Church » nor of the « harsh necessity to subscribe slave » before taking orders. He did not in his youth criticise the profession from the point of view of one seeking to enter it.

Perhaps indeed at the time of his earlier explanations, this reason, inspired by that love of liberty always so characteristic of Milton, which does him honour, was not even in his mind. As Hanford says further on in his article :

It is significant that neither in this passage [*Lycidas*] nor in anything else written during his early years does Milton give utterance to the passion for political and intellectual freedom which became one of the supreme inspiring motives of his eloquence (3).

It is an example (and there are others) of the motive for an act being discovered at the moment when an explanation seems desirable. The psychologists have a word for this sort of subsequent justification, this system of finding in one's past, after the fact, reasons which seem at the later date to have justified one's actions. They call it « rationalisation ». The reasons that rationalisation finds for our conduct are always honourable to us.

2.

MILTON AND THE THEATRE.

In 1641-42, at the time of the famous controversy of the « Smectymnuans » with Bishop Hall (4), when Milton came to the aid of the former : « Hall and his son », says Masson, « made such a blunder as to attack Milton on the ground of his morals. » They implied that he went to the theatre and to worse places.

(1) TILLYARD, *Private Correspondence*, p. 8.

(2) *Lyc.*, v. 113-29.

(3) *The Youth of Milton*, pp. 156-57.

(4) MASSON, II, pp. 390-402.

Milton, instead of replying that he had been to the theatre in London and enjoyed it, evades the point and explains that he had seen some comedies performed by divinity students at Cambridge (which gave him an excellent occasion at the same time to speak ill of the clergy). He made this reply in the *Apology* : (1)

But since there is such necessity to the hearsay of a tire, a periwig, or a visard, that plays must have been seen, what difficulty was there in that ? When in the colleges so many of the young divines, and those in next aptitude to divinity, have been seen so often on the stage, writhing and unbending their clergy limbs to all the antic and dishonest gestures of Trinculoes, buffoons, and bawds ; prostituting the shame of that ministry, which either they had, or were nigh having, to the eyes of courtiers and court ladies, with their grooms and mademoiselles. There, while they acted and overacted, among other young scholars, I was a spectator ; they thought themselves gallant men, and I thought them fools ; they made sport, and I laughed, they mispronounced, and I disliked ; and to make up the atticism, they were out, and I hissed. Judge now whether so many good textmen were not sufficient to instruct me of false beards and vizards, without more expositors ; and how can this confuter take the face to object to me the seeing of that which his reverend prelates allow, and incite their young disciples to act ? For if it be unlawful to sit and behold a mercenary personating that which is least unseemly for a hireling to do, how much more blameful is it to endure the sight of as vile things acted by persons either entered, or presently to enter into the ministry ; and how much more foul and ignominious for them to be the actors !

But had Milton then never seen any plays upon the professional stage ? Twelve years after the appearance of the *Apology*, in the *Second Defence of the English People*, Milton in speaking of his youthful years at Horton mentions as his sole diversion in London his visits to the booksellers, seeking whatever there was new in music or mathematics (2). But we know from Edward Phillips that the young Milton had not always been the grave Puritan of the pamphlets : « ..once in three weeks or a month, he would drop into the Society of some Young Sparks of his Acquaintance, the chief whereof were Mr. Alphry and Mr. Miller, two Gentlemen of Gray's Inn, the *Beaus* of those Times, but nothing near so bad as those now-a-days : (3) with these Gentlemen he would so far make bold with his Body, as now and then to keep a Gawdy-day. » (4)

If we are to believe that Milton never, either in the pleasant company of Mr. Alphry or another, or alone, entered a London theatre, we must neglect the internal evidence of his verses, both in Latin

(1) S. M., p. 548.

(2) P. W. p. 719 ; BOHN, I, p. 255.

(3) PHILLIPS wrote under the Restoration.

(4) DARBISHIRE, *op. cit.*, p. 62.

and in English. The charming lines in his *First Elegy* (27-48) sound as if they had been written by a connoisseur and habitué of the play-house, who was a judge of acting and could appreciate actors :

He who said of the acting of the *ingénue* : (1)

Saepe novos illic virgo mirata calores,
Quid sit amor nescit; dum quoque nescit amat (vv. 36-37) (2).

was not only familiar with the theatre (*pompa theatri*, v. 27) but loved it.

Moreover, it is probable that those young divinity students played only ancient pieces in Greek or Latin. The indications as to plot and character which Milton gives in the *First Elegy* when recalling plays that he had seen, do not correspond to any of the classic plays. We have Professor Rand's authority for this :

It is hard to tell, from his [Milton's] words whether he means the actual theatre of his day or merely his reading in the ancient drama. I think he means both, now giving stock examples from the ancient stage, now suggesting modern plays from ancient examples, and now referring to what could come only from a modern play. [And in Note 4 on the same page Professor Rand adds] : The lawyer, pregnant with a ten-years' suit, thundering barbarous words before an ignorant court, does not correspond to anything that I can recall in the ancient comedy. (3)

Virgo mirata calores. Is it likely that it was in thinking of those young theologians « writhing and unboning their clergy limbs » (4) that the sensitive young poet in love with all the arts wrote these charming lines ? Is it not more probable that when in later years his satirical recollection prompted him to make fun of them, it is partly because he had seen real acting and knew what it was ?

There is also the internal evidence of the English verses. No reader of Milton forgets the celebrated lines from *L'Allegro*, written supposedly at Horton (5), certainly in early youth. It would be unnatural to offer as marginal note to these verses the observation : « Milton would have us believe that he never went to the theatre, consequently he had never seen Jonson or Shakespeare played and knew their works

(1) Although women's rôles were of course played by boys, illusion was not destroyed for spectators who had never seen a woman on the stage. The theatre of every age accepts its own conventions. The mask and buskin did not diminish the effect of Sophocles for Greek audiences.

(2) Or Maids, new fires that prove,

Of love naught knowing, yet — unknowing — love. (Translated by Skeat : *Milton's Lament for Damon, and his Other Latin Poems*, London, Oxford Press, 1935, p. 6).

(3) E. K. RAND, *Milton in Rustication*, S. P., XIX (April, 1922), p. 113.

(4) But see TILLYARD, *The Miltonic Setting Past and Present*, Cambridge University Press, 1938, pp. 1-7.

(5) Then to the well-trod stage anon,

If Jonson's learned sock be on,

Or gentle Shakespeare, fancy's child,

Warble his native wood-notes wild. (vv. 131-34).

only from his reading. » Professor Alwyn Thaler, writing in 1920 without thinking of the Latin prose, did not suppose it necessary to raise the question here discussed : « ...he took keen delight in the well-trod stage », « he enjoyed the theatre in his youth... » (1)

At the time he wrote them, his friends would not have dreamed of making it a reproach to him that he had visited a London theatre.

Perhaps the political pamphleteer who was just winning his spurs in 1641-42 had forgotten the emotions of the young esthete of the elegies. At any rate the tone of voice is no longer the same. This change, which was to increase so markedly after 1649 must correspond to something deeper. In constructing for the uses of his party that « ideal conception of his personality » of which Hanford speaks, Milton presents an image which is not at all that of a poet or an artist. Charm, grace, and good taste have no part in it. He denies for his youthful self what was the essence of all his early poetry, and in so doing probably destroys something within himself for the future.

3.

THE RETURN FROM ITALY.

a) *The Motive :*

In the careful portrait of himself which Milton presents in his *Second Defence of the English People*, which was the chief work of his official life, he gives his reason for cutting short his sojourn in Italy in 1638-39 : « When I was preparing to pass over into Sicily and Greece, « the melancholy intelligence which I received of the civil commotions in England made me alter my purpose ; for I thought it base « to be travelling for amusement abroad, while my fellow-citizens « were fighting for liberty at home. » (2)

The reason is not false, but it is only a half-truth. Milton omits to say that, having renounced (at Naples, in December, '38) his idea of visiting Greece and Sicily because of the civil war in England, he then lingered on in Rome for two months, spent two more months in Florence on his second visit to that city, and thereafter visited Bologna, Ferrara, Venice and Geneva before reaching home (3). He did not reach England, according to Masson, until July or August 1639 (4).

(1) *Milton in the Theatre*. S. P., XVII (July, 1920), pp. 270, 272.

(2) BOHN, I, p. 256 : « In Siciliam quoque et Græciam trajicere volentem me, tristis ex Anglia belli civilis nuntius revocavit » (P. W., p. 719).

(3) BOHN, I, p. 256.

(4) I, p. 779.

Nor does he mention that for two years after his return until the publication of *Of Reformation touching Church Discipline in England* in 1641 he had done nothing in particular for the cause of his « fellow-citizens fighting for liberty at home ». He took a house in London and set up a little school.

Liljegren (1), in drawing attention to this omission, draws from it a conclusion which is rather unjust to Milton :

Therefore, when we further compare his statement with the fact that, contrary to expectation from such a sentiment, he returned even more leisurely than he went, staying for several months at Rome, at Florence, and making a long circuit to Venice, Verona, etc., we must explain the proclaimed cause as an afterthought intended for public exhibition.

But Milton's explanation was not a mere afterthought. We may be sure of that from the evidence contained in the *Epitaphium Damonis*, which was written a little more than a year after he reached England to learn of Diodati's death, and thirteen or fourteen years before the declaration as to his motives which is found in the *Second Defence* :

...pastorem scilicet illum
Dulcis amor Musæ Thusca retinebat in urbe.
Ast ubi mens expleta domum, pecorisque relictī
Cura vocat (2).

This is an incontrovertible proof that the poet's sentiments regarding the civil war at home and his responsibility to it were such as he described them long afterwards in the *Defensio Secunda*. The *Epitaphium* still belongs to, it is indeed the last work of, the period of directness and simplicity, when Milton was still only a poet.

But, as we said at the beginning of this chapter, his explanation presents but one face of the truth, the favourable one. He turned homewards, it is true, but lingered six months more on his way back to England. This he says nothing about.

b) *The Date* :

The date that Milton gives for his return from Italy presents another disparity which corresponds to a possible similar desire to present only lofty motives for his acts. Here again it is Liljegren who has assembled the facts.

Milton says, as has been seen, that his decision to return to England was made at Naples because of the news which reached him

(1) - *Op. cit.*, p. 16.

(2) True is, him over long

In Tuscan city stay'd soft charm of song.

But when a mind full furnish't and the thought

Of his neglected flock him homeward brought... (*Milton's Lament for Damon*, p. 94).

there of the civil war at home, and that he arrived at the beginning of the Second Bishops' War. But both these statements are inexact. Neither of these dates corresponds to the facts. As Liljegren says : (1)

The passage where Milton declares that, on gathering the news about the outbreak of the First Bishops' War, he turned homewards at Naples because he would not travel abroad for his pleasure, when, at home, his countrymen were contending for their liberty, this passage has aroused much admiration. Simple chronology, however, shows that Milton's words conflict with facts. The negotiations between Charles and the Scots continued through 1638 and the first months of 1639. In March only, when Milton had been on his way home for three months and was staying at Florence, came the sudden outbreak of the Civil War.

And in a note on the same page :

Note that Milton stated his return as coinciding with the outbreak of the Second Bishops' War. This war began in August 1640. Milton arrived in England in the summer of 1639. Cf. Masson, *Life*, II, 3 ff., who states Milton's return at the beginning of the *Second Bishops' War* and then fills more than a hundred pages with the description of the two Bishops' Wars without perceiving the incompatibility of the statements. To me this is in accordance with Masson's, I may say superstitious, belief in Milton's words.

Of these two inexact dates one may perhaps be considered as due to a simple slip of memory without bearing. But the other is of more importance. That one of the reasons for his return was his anxiety about affairs at home is, as was stated above, borne out by the *Epitaphium Damonis*. But that it was because of this anxiety that he renounced at Naples his idea of travelling to Greece and Sicily, must be false. He had already renounced it and was already as far as Florence on his homeward route before the news could have reached him. This is proved by the date of his letter to Holstenius from Florence dated March 13th, 1639 (2).

Once more truth was not Milton's chief concern. His chief concern was to communicate a certain impression, useful but partly false. Such is the method of political propagandists.

4.

THE JESUITS AND THE CARDINAL.

Milton was always glad and proud to mention the great men who had honoured or befriended him, and as a method of adding to the

(1) *Op. cit.*, p. 16.

(2) TILLYARD, *Correspondence*, p. 21.

authority of his rôle in the Commonwealth this was effective and legitimate. It enhanced his value as defender of the Republic, to be able to say that he had been received with kindness by distinguished men during his travels abroad. But there are certain omissions from his lists which appear to be full of meaning.

We know that in Italy Milton was the guest of Cardinal Barberini (1) and that he dined with the English Jesuits in Rome (2). But these honours, while very acceptable to a young poet who was easily touched by the aesthetic aspects of religion (3), became embarrassing to confess on the part of a Roundhead propagandist. In summing up the hospitalities of which he had been the object while in Italy, Milton omits these.

The only allusion which he makes to the English Jesuits is with regard to their intriguing against him because of the boldness with which he spoke up for his Protestant beliefs. This he recalls in the *Second Defense* :

When I was on my way back to Rome [from Naples] some merchants informed me that the English Jesuits had formed a plot against me if I returned to Rome, because I had spoken too freely on religion ; for it was a rule which I laid down to myself in those places, never to be the first to begin any conversation on religion ; but if any questions were put to me concerning my faith, to declare it without any reserve or fear (4).

In this narrative », says Liljegren (5), « Milton's courageous behaviour in the close and dangerous atmosphere of Italy has received most attention and been commented upon (6). It has even excited some wonder that, with such conduct in those, the most vigorous days of the Inquisition, he should escape unhurt, though, as he asserts, especially sought for by the English Jesuits in Rome. The wonder increases in face of the fact that according to an entry found in the Travellers' Book of the English Jesuit College in Rome, Milton even enjoyed the hospitality of these his enemies : (7) ...their invitation presupposes friendly relations and reciprocal forbearance in religious matters. Even if we infer that a rupture took place between the above entry and the alleged persecution, this does not explain the inefficacy of the Inquisition, the peaceful presence of the Jesuit-hater among his foes...

(1) Letter to Holstenius, TELLYARD, *Correspondence*, p. 20.

(2) LILJEGREN, *Studies*, pp. 15-16.

(3) *Il Penseroso*, v. 155-66.

(4) BOHN, I, p. 256. « Roman autem reversurum... monebant mercatores se didicisse per literas parari mihi ab Jesuitis Anglis insidias, si Roman reverterem ; eo quod de religione nimis liberé loquutus essem. Sic enim mecum statueram, de religione quidem iis in locis sermones ultro non inferre ; interrogatus de fide, quicquid essem passurus, nihil dissimulare. Roman itaque nihilominus redii. » (*P. W.*, p. 719).

(5) *Ibid.*

(6) I do not of course wish in any way to belittle Milton's courage, nor to question the *insidias* against him of which he complains.

(7) « Octobris die 30. Pransi sunt in Collegio nostro Illustrissimus D. N. Cary frater baronis Faulkland, Doctor Holdingus, Lancastrensis, D. N. Fortescuto, et Dominus Miltonus, cum famulo, nobiles Angli, et excepti sunt laute. » (*Com. pl. book*, p. 16).

There seems no reason to doubt the hostile attitude of the Jesuits. Although there is no external evidence in proof of Milton's statement, it is partly corroborated by a letter from Heinsius written from Venice fifteen years later. Writing to one of his friends in Amsterdam, he says with regard to Salmasius's insinuation against Milton's morals :

What he [Saumaise] says about Milton's conduct in Italy is mere calumny... That Englishman was even disliked by the Italians, among whom he lived a long time, on account of his too severe morals, though he would freely dispute about religion, and hit out strongly against the Pope on any occasion. (1)

But of the invitation to dinner there is no doubt, and of this Milton says nothing. At the time when he was maintaining his rôle in the *Defensio Secunda*, a work of government propaganda, to have insisted upon the Jesuits' politeness accepted by him would have been impolitic ; the mention of their threats against him was useful.

Cardinal Francesco Barberini, Prime Minister at the Vatican, was a great personage in Rome at the time of Milton's visit. He had constituted himself in some sort the host and patron of visiting Englishmen of consequence, and we know that his attentions were not indifferent to Milton. Liljegren does not say why he thinks it probable that it was during the second Roman sojourn that Milton enjoyed them (2). It is apparent that Masson assigns them to the first (3), and it appears more probable that the young Englishman should have been received by the Cardinal while he was still on good terms with the English Jesuits. The rupture in relations imagined in Liljegren's hypothesis might well have taken place between his two stays in Rome, because of the poet's indiscreet Protestant zeal which chilled Manso's interest in him at Naples :

There I was introduced ...to John Baptista Manso, a nobleman of distinguished rank and authority... During my stay, he gave me singular proofs of his regard : he himself conducted me round the city, and to the palace of the viceroy ; and more than once paid me a visit at my lodgings. On my departure he gravely apologized for not having shewn me more civility, which he said he had been restrained from doing, because I had spoken with so little reserve on matters of religion (4),

In his letter to Lucas Holstenius, librarian at the Vatican, to whom

(1) Letter from Heinsius to Vossius of the 28th February, 1653. (MASSON, IV, 475).

(2) *Op. cit.*, p. 16.

(3) I, pp. 799-802.

(4) BOHN, I, p. 256. « ...ad Joannem Baptistam Mansum, marchionem Villensem, virum nobilissimum atque gravissimum... sum introductus, eodemque usus, quamdiu illic fui, sane amicissimo : qui et ipse me per urbis loca et proregis aulam circumduxit, et visendi gratia haud semel ipse ad hospitium venit : Discedenti serio excusavit se, tametsi multo plura detulisse mihi officia maxime cupiebat, non potuisse illa in urbe, propterea quod nolebam in religione esse tectior ». (P. W., p. 719).

he owed his introduction to Barberini, Milton shows plainly how gratified he had been by the Cardinal's courtesies :

I cannot but think that it was owing to your recommending me to his Eminence Cardinal Francesco Barberini that at the public concert which he gave a few days later with truly Roman magnificence, he himself stood at the door to receive me, sought me out in that great crowd, and almost taking me by the hand, pressed me to enter, with every mark of honour. When I went next day to pay my respects as his graciousness demanded, it was again you whom I had to thank for procuring me an audience and the opportunity of conversing with him. The great man, who, for all his high rank, is the soul of courtesy and friendliness, granted me an audience which, considering the time and place, inclined to lengthiness rather than brevity (1).

Yet despite his evident satisfaction in recalling these civilities, Milton never, as far as we can now ascertain, mentioned Cardinal Barberini. His name does not appear on the list he gives in *Epitaphium Damonis* of celebrated Italians that he had known during his travels (among whom we find Manso) (2), nor in the famous passage in the *Defensio secunda*, where he was consciously trying to put himself in a good light as defender of the Commonwealth. He seems not even to have mentioned him in familiar conversation in his household, since his nephews, proud of their uncle's distinction and importance among distinguished men, do not name the Cardinal amongst them.

But John Diodati, the celebrated Protestant theologian, appears on all the lists.

5.

MILTON AND GALILEO.

Although Milton might have felt there were objections to announcing to the world that he had been the guest of Cardinal and the English Jesuits of Rome, the opposite was evidently true for Galileo, whom Milton says he saw in Florence. As witness of his supposed conversation with him, Milton left in the *Areopagitica* a single beautiful sentence full of restrained emotion : « I found and visited the « famous Galileo, grown old, a prisoner to the Inquisition, for thinking in astronomy otherwise than the Franciscan and Dominican « licensers thought. » (3)

(1) TILLYARD, *Correspondence*, p. 20.

(2) To whom Milton also dedicated one of his finest Latin poems. (*S. M.*, p. 143-45).

(3) *Areop.* 1644, *S. M.*, p. 745.

Despite this simple and direct statement, Liljegren does not believe that Milton ever saw Galileo at all. This for three reasons :

a) There were great practical difficulties in the way because of the Inquisition, which forbade access of all visitors to Galileo and would have made it impossible for Milton to see him at that time. This argument is supported by a mass of historical documentation to which I refer the reader (1).

Miss M. H. Nicolson has reworked all this material very fully in a recent article (2), and has come to the opposite conclusion (3). She does not believe that the political situation and the rule of the Inquisition rendered Milton's visit to Galileo totally impossible.

But Liljegren adduces two other arguments, which are in the realm of internal evidence and psychology. These seem to me important, and there are certain minor points to be brought up in confirmation of them.

b) Liljegren reminds us that Milton does not mention Galileo in the celebrated autobiographical passage in the *Second Defence of the English People*, where he recounts his sojourns in Italy and mentions — with the express purpose, as we have already seen, of showing his own worth and importance — the prominent Italian notabilities whom he had met. Masson himself says : « the reason why Milton « refers to these incidents in so precise a manner is that when he « wrote the passage [in the *Second Defence*] he was offering proofs « of his respectability. » (4) Galileo was an excellent reference. Why this omission ?

Because, replies Liljegren, the *Defensio Secunda*, unlike the *Areopagitica* which was written in English and would be read only in England, was in Latin and intended for readers on the Continent. These would have been in a position to know it if the statements were false.

The *Areopagitica* where the visit is mentioned was written in English five years after his Italian journey. Ten years later he wrote the *Defensio Secunda* in Latin, a language understood throughout the world at that time, and there, as seen above, he gave a full account of that journey. Here, if anywhere, we should expect to hear the visit to Galileo mentioned, but this is *not* the case, whereas Milton relates how he had seen Grotius at Paris, etc. In the same treatise he defends himself against the taunts of his enemies on account of his blindness, and does so by enumerating great men from ancient and recent times that have been blind. Here Galileo seems to be the most apt and celebrated instance, but his name is wanting.

(1) *Studies*, pp. 25-34.

(2) *Milton and the Telescope*, *ELH*, II (1935) 1-32.

(3) *Op. cit.*, p. 8-9.

(4) I, 753.

These singular circumstances have already been noted by Bernhardi...

That Milton had not forgotten Galileo but remembered him particularly well at the time he wrote his *Defensio Secunda* we know, because just then he began seriously to occupy himself with his great epos and there the allusions to Galileo take a very conspicuous place from the first. (1)

« Milton relates how he had seen Grotius at Paris, etc. » This « etc. » is very inclusive. Milton has a great deal to say in the *Defensio Secunda* of celebrated people he had met :

The noble Thomas Scudamore, King Charles's ambassador... the celebrated Henry Wootton... the learned Hugo Grotius, at that time ambassador from the Queen of Sweden to the French Court... No time will ever abolish the agreeable recollections which I, cherish of Jacob Gaddi, Carolo Dati, Frescobaldo, Cultellero, Bonomattei, Clementillo, Francisco and many others... Rome... where I experienced the most friendly attentions from Lucas Holstenius... There [in Naples] I was introduced to John Baptista Manso, Marquis of Villa, a nobleman of distinguished rank and authority... During my stay, he gave me singular proofs of his regard : he himself conducted me round the city, and to the palace of the viceroy, and more than once paid me a visit at my lodgings... At Geneva I held daily conferences with John Deodati, the learned professor of theology. (2)

As a matter of fact, the only absentees from his list are Cardinal Barberini and Galileo.

With regard to our knowledge of Milton's acquaintance with these two men, the example of the Cardinal is the converse of that of Galileo. The Cardinal is never mentioned in any of his writings for the public, but his private letter to Holstenius (3) is proof that he had been received with courtesy at Palazzo Barberini and was very proud of it. For his visit to Galileo we have Milton's explicit statement published in a famous pamphlet, but there is no personal (or other) evidence to support it. The statement is made not in connection with the Italian sojourn, not in connection with the celebrities whose friendship he had enjoyed, but solely with regard to the freedom of the press. Galileo was a magnificent example of punishment suffered for opinions at the hands of the Roman Inquisition, and to give greater vivacity to

(1) LILJEGREN, *Milton and Galileo*, (op. cit., p. 35) ; cf. *P. L.*, I, 284 sq., III, 588-90 ; V. 257 sq.

(2) BOHN, I, p. 256-57. « Commendatum ab aliis nobilissimus vir Thomas Scudamorus vicecomes Segonensis, Caroli regis legatus, Parisiis humanissime accepit ; meque Hugoni Grotio viro eruditissimo, ab regina Suecorum tunc temporis ad Gallias regem legato... Tui enim Jacobe Gaddi, Carole Dati, Frescobalde, Cultelline, Bonmatthæi, Clementille, Francine, aliorum que plurium memoriam, apud me semper gratam atque jucundam, nulla dies delebit. Florentia Senas, inde Romam profectus... (ubi et Luca Holstenio, aliisque viris cum doctis tum ingeniosis, sum usus humanissimi), Neapolim perrexi : Illic ad Joannem Baptistam Mansum, marchionem Villensem, virum nobilissimum atque gravissimum... sum introductus... Genevæ cum Joanne Deodato, theologia professore doctissimo, quotidianus versabar. (*P. W.*, p. 719).

3) v. *supra*, p. 81.

this example what could be better than Milton's own vivid recollection of him in prison ?

The great astronomer would have seemed more important, probably, to the readers of the *Second Defence* than any of the distinguished Europeans on Milton's list, except possibly Grotius. He certainly would have furnished a subject of conversation more attractive and picturesque, and have exercised a greater fascination over the spirit of a poet than the learned Dutchman who had been the ornament of the Swedish court. Nevertheless Grotius and the others made part of the family tradition and familiar reminiscence in Aldersgate Street, since both nephews (1) mention him. Neither names Galileo !

This is a case where in order to believe Milton we shall simply have to follow Masson and assure ourselves that Milton must be held incapable of an untruth.

If this fail,
The pillar'd firmament is rott'nness.

(*Comus*, v. 596-97.)

c) Liljegren believes that Milton at the time of his arrival in Florence, was unaware that Galileo was blind and had been so for six months : (2)

Galileo, about whose being blind Milton is so persistently silent in his writings that we can hardly believe he knew it... (3)

If Milton had visited Galileo, he must have perceived that he was blind, and to him — especially when he became blind himself — this fact would probably have been more prominent in the memory than any of those above. (4)

To this I would add that it seems impossible that a great poet could have missed seeing the poetic value in the idea of a great astronomer who could no longer see the stars. Yet not only does he not mention this in the sole allusion to Galileo in the prose, the sentence above quoted from the *Areopagitica*, but even in the two passages about him in *Paradise Lost* there is not the slightest indication that the « Tuscan artist » was blind. On the contrary, Milton presents him to us as seeing, as gazing through his telescope :

like the moon, whose orb
Through optic glass the Tuscan artist views
At evening. (5)

(1) DARBISHIRE, *op. cit.*, p. 19, 56. (v. *infra.*, p. 89, note (4).

(2) This fact was established by the Florentine authorities in February, 1638. (LILJEGREN, *op. cit.*, p. 27).

(3) *Op. cit.*, p. 18.

(4) *Op. cit.*, p. 36.

(5) *P. L.*, I, 287-90.

...as when by night the glass
Of Galileo, less assured, *observes*
Imagined lands and regions in the Moon. (1)

Now whether it be chance or premonition, it is certain that Milton never missed an occasion to speak of those great men of the past who were blind. Masson noted this, of course : « I know not whether the « reader has observed with me, in Milton's writings hitherto, a certain fascination of the fancy, as if by unconscious presentiment, « on the topic of blindness (2). »

There is mention of blind Tiresias in the *Sixth Elegy* (3), and in *De Idea Platonica* (4). There is an allusion to blind Œdipus : (*Œdipodoniā... noctem*), in *Naturam non pati senium* (5). In the later poems we find :

Blind Thamyris and blind Mæonides,
And Tiresias and Phineus, (6)

and

Blind Melesigenes, thence Homer called. (7)

And we need not remind the reader of the numerous personal allusions, so well known and so touching, to the poet's own case (8) ; nor of *Samson Agonistes*, which takes a blind man for its hero (9).

Still more to the purpose is the famous passage in the *Second Defence of the English People*, in which Milton defends himself against those who would see in his blindness a mark of the divine disfavour (10).

He does so [as an early commentator, Bernhardt, long ago observed] by enumerating great men from ancient and modern times that have been blind. Here Galileo seems to be the most apt and celebrated instance, but his name is wanting. (11)

Milton begins by a general allusion to « those wise and ancient bards », then mentions by name Tiresias, Timoleon of Corinth, Appius Claudius, Cecilius Metellus, the great patriarchs Isaac and Jacob ; then « others of later times, Dandolo of Venice, the incomparable Doge, Boemar Zisca... Jerome Zanchius, and some other theologians.

(1) *P. L.*, V. 261-63.

(2) *I*, p. 789.

(3) *vv.* 67-68.

(4) *vv.* 25-26.

(5) *vv.* 2-3.

(6) *P. L.*, III, 35-36.

(7) *P. R.*, IV, 259.

(8) Especially the two sonnets : XIX, on his blindness, and XXII, the second of those addressed to Cyriack Skinner, and the beginning of Book III of *P. L.*

(9) And see Eleanor G. Brown : *Milton's Blindness* (*Columbia University Studies in English and Comparative Literature*, New-York, 1934, pp. 51-77).

(10) Bohn, I, 236-37 ; *P. W.*, p. 713.

(11) Liljegren, *op. cit.*, p. 35.

Galileo was a living contemporary, whom he could say he had himself seen ; was he not well worthy of a place at least in a subordinate clause, along with those of « later times » ?

This internal evidence seems to my mind quite as important as the historical question whether or not the Inquisition would have rendered it materially impossible for Milton to visit Galileo. Yet even before Miss Nicolson's masterly reply to Liljegren's array of historical evidence, the Anglo-Saxon critics remained unconvinced. Mrs. Raymond makes several allusions to « the visit to Galileo » as to an authentic historic fact that cannot be questioned, and for all refutation of Liljegren contents herself with saying, without quoting or answering any of his arguments : « Liljegren denies that Milton met Galileo. To me his arguments are not convincing. » (1) It is to be noted that Mr. Hanford, like Miss Nicolson, does not consider the evidence that is merely subjective. He rests on his certitude of Milton's veracity (2).

And in truth this is the only time an express statement of Milton's would have to be rejected in order to accept the theory that in his public role he made use of evasions and prevarications that he would not have employed in his personal life. Morally, this false statement would be less reprehensible than the forgery of the Pamela Prayer in the *Eikon*, for which there is such a wealth of external evidence, but perhaps it would be more difficult for the Puritan conscience. Yet in view of the equivocations and half-truths assembled in this chapter, which Milton published over his signature during the period of his political life, I cannot share Professor Hanford's conviction when the motive involved may be political as well as personal.

But it may be asked how an allusion to his visit to Galileo, in 1642 (the year of the publication of the *Areopagitica*) when Milton was not yet considered as the official and responsible spokesman of his party, could have seemed to have a utilitarian value. Precisely because he was not yet so considered, because he was still but a volunteer worker ; and because at thirty-four he was full of doubts and anxieties as to his own maturity and authority (3). The mention of his visit to Galileo, whether true or false, is one of the first touches in that portrait of himself as a responsible and authoritative writer in defence of the ideas of civil liberty he championed.

For Liljegren, the statement in question is but « an unfounded display of acquaintance with a celebrity » (4), but here again my interpretation of Milton's character does not agree with Professor Liljegren's.

(1) *Op. cit.*, Note to Chapter IV, p. 309.

(2) *Handbook*, p. 3.

(3) *v. supra*, pp. 70.

(4) *Op. cit.*, p. 26.

Milton's motive must rather be sought in that desire to appear before the public as a trustworthy defender of the new ideas. The *Aeropagitica* was published only two years after *Reason of Church Government*, in which Milton solemnly affirms his consecration to the cause of the Reformed Religion (1), declaring that he is forced « to contest with men of high estimation now while green years are upon my head » (2). In his autobiographical preface to the same work, he displays fear lest he be not considered equal to his high task :

...And if any man incline to think I undertake a task too difficult for my years, I trust through the supreme enlightening assistance far otherwise (8).

There is, as Hanford says, « a real inward questioning of his capacity » (4).

We have no need of the motive of vanity or snobbery, which Liljegren suggests here as he did in the history of Morus (5). We have another, more characteristic of Milton, who always needed to reassure himself in reassuring his public. As he said in the *Apology* (6): « I thought it my duty, if not to myself, yet to the religious cause I had in hand, not to leave the least spot or blemish in good name. »

From this to adding a touch, an argument, an ornament, and always in view of the high purposes that he sincerely believed to be divine, it is not, perhaps, such a very long step.

6.

HIDDEN MOTIVES.

There is a famous paragraph in the *Second Defence of the English People* which has often been quoted with respect, but in which Liljegren thinks he detects a deliberate half-truth :

When, therefore, I perceived that there are three species of liberty which are essential to the happiness of social life — religious, domestic and civil ; — and as I had already written concerning the first, and the magistrates were strenuously active concerning the third, I determined to turn my attention to the second, or the domestic species. As this seemed to involve three material questions, the conditions of the conjugal tie, the education

(1) *S. M.*, p. 523-25.

(2) *Ibid.*, p. 524.

(3) *S. M.*, p. 505.

(4) *Creative Personality*, p. 336.

(5) *Op. cit.*, p. 36.

(6) *S. M.*, p. 542. *v. infra*, p. 99.

of the children, and the free publication of the thoughts, I made them objects of distinct consideration (1).

« This sounds rather magnificent, » observes Liljegren, « but nevertheless it is not true, as is pointed out by several of Milton's biographers, the treatises rising evidentially out of his own personal affairs. » (2)

Here again I think that Liljegren simplifies too much, and that makes him harsh. The two implications in his sentence are not mutually exclusive. There is little doubt that in these « magnificent » phrases Milton was telling the truth ; only, there were personal motives too, and these he thought fit not to mention. It must be admitted that in the autobiographical passage of the *Defensio Secunda*, whenever it happened that there were a variety of motives for the same action, Milton chose to put forward the noblest.

All his life Milton studied and examined himself, but whereas in his youth it was in order to measure himself against his ideal with the intention of ever coming nearer and nearer to attaining it, later on it was with the purpose of defending himself, of proving that he had always been in all respects what his public would approve. It is difficult to do this, even with the highest purpose, without often deceiving oneself. Only a cynic can succeed in deceiving the public without deceiving himself, and Milton was no cynic. He was no Machiavelli, he was no Tartuffe, he always believed passionately in the right. But during the years of his political life, at least, he was a Puritan ; and the Puritan feels the need to « justify » himself (3). He has to see himself as always impelled by the highest motives only, and the desire to justify all his actions in his own eyes becomes the necessity to « rationalize » them. Intellectual honesty becomes difficult for the rationalizer.

In the effort to prove by the following quotations that Milton's motives were sometimes mixed, that he acted for the public good but at times *also* for personal reasons — without which perhaps the public good would not have been served in respect to those particular needs — I have not the slightest wish to disparage those personal motives

(1) BOHN, I, p. 258. « Cum itaque tres omnino animadverterem libertatis esse species, quæ nisi adsint, vita ulla transigi commodè vix possit, ecclesiasticam, domesticam seu privatam, atque civilem, deque prima jam scripsissem, deque tertia magistratum sedulo agere viderem, quæ reliqua secunda erat, domesticam mihi desumpsi ; ea quoque tripartita, cum videretur esse, si res conjugalis si liberorum institutio recte se haberet, si denique libere philosophandi potestas esset, de conjugio, non solum rite contrahendo, verum etiam, si necesse esset, dissolvendo, quid sentirem explicui. » (P. W., p. 720).

(2) *Op cit.*, p. 14.

(3) As Hanford says in a slightly different connection : « It is only by convincing himself that in prosecuting private enmities, he is exposing and correcting public delinquencies, that he is enabled to take that satisfaction in his achievement which is for him a psychological necessity [*italics mine*]. » (Handbook, p. 88).

involved or say that Milton's treatises in defence of the people's liberties would have been nobler had they been impersonally disinterested. Not at all. My purpose is merely to show that Milton does not *admit* that his motives were mixed. Perhaps he was not aware of it himself. But his spirit has by the same token lost something of the limpidity of his youth, and this fact is of immense importance for a poet. The poet of *Comus* was single-minded ; the poet of *Paradise Lost* was not. Each of these instances of equivocation and self-deception detailed in the present work was helping to modify the instrument on which the poet had to play, from which he was to draw his later music.

In the defence of the freedom of the press, the private motive was evidently Milton's anger at having himself been annoyed with regard to those of his pamphlets that had been printed without a licence (1). Mrs. Raymond does not hesitate to state this clearly :

Milton's indignation at the insults he had suffered from the licensers and at the stealthy sale by which his unlicensed pamphlets had to reach the public, resulted in a defense and accusation so luminous as to shine for all time as a beacon to free speech. [i. e., the *Areopagitica*] (2).

And B. A. Wright supports her :

A similar affront to his personal dignity and comfort, actually arising out of the unlicensed publication of the first divorce tract, was the immediate occasion of the *Areopagitica* ; and here again the views expressed were such as we know him to have formed long before and to have believed of public moment. (3).

With regard to the pamphlets on divorce, the personal motive was still more powerful and equally obvious. Milton's nephews (4) speak with entire simplicity of their uncle's personal reasons for these writings :

Hee in this interval, who had entered into that State for the end designed by God and Nature, and was then in the full vigour of his Manhood, could ill bear the disappointment hee met with by her obstinate absenting : And therefore thought upon a Divorce, that hee might be free to marry another ; concerning which he was also in treaty. The lawfulness and expedience of this, duly regulat in order to all those purposes, for which Marriage was at first instituted ; had upon full consideration and reading good Authors, bin formerly his Opinion : And the necessity of

(1) « Poets are the worst dissemblers or economisers of truth in the world, » says Raleigh. (*Milton*, p. 53).

(2) MASSON, III, p. 265-75 ; RAYMOND, *op. cit.*, p. 69-100.

(3) *Op. cit.*, p. 89.

(4) *Milton's First Marriage*, M. L. R., XXVI (1931), p. 399.

(4) If we can accept Miss Darbishire's theory that the « Anonymous Life » was written by John Phillips. Cf. E. S. PARSONS, *The Anonymous Life of Milton*, P. M. L. A., L (1934), p. 1057-64.

justifying himself now concurring with the opportunity, acceptable to him, of instructing others in a point of so great concern to the peace and preservation of Families ; and so likely to prevent temptations as well as mischiefs, he first writt the *Doctrine and Discipline*, then *Colasterion*, and after *Tetrachordon*. (1)

However, it [the obstinate absence of Mary] so incensed our Author, that he thought it would be dishonorable ever to receive her again, after such a repulse ; so that he forthwith prepared to Fortify himself with Arguments for such a Resolution, and accordingly wrote two Treatises, by which he undertook to maintain, That it was against Reason (and the enjoyment of it is not proveable by Scripture) for any Married Couple disagreeable in Humour and Temper, or having an aversion to each other, to be forc'd to live yok'd together all their days. (2)

And Wright again admits the case :

What more characteristic of Milton than to vindicate in public a course of action already determined on ? It was the habit of justifying himself, together with the habit of identifying what he wanted with the public good, that made Milton a natural pamphleteer... it is still possible that Milton did not write without regard to his own divorce. However, the main point is that, whether or not he had any such practical end in view, Milton would be impelled to justify himself to the world and to magnify his private predicament into an affair of public moment (3).

And a little further on he says :

Yet to say that Milton might have written on the question in any case does not deny the possibility that his own marriage brought home to him the urgency of the problem and was the actual occasion prompting him to a public expression of his views (4).

But Wright is unwilling to see in the supporting presence of unconfessed private motives the slightest ground for criticism of Milton (5), and he speaks of Professor Liljegren's attitude towards this question not merely harshly but unjustly :

...Professor Liljegren assumes the divorce tracts to be due simply to Milton's matrimonial rebuff, cites the passage as an instance of Miltonian hypocrisy and deceit. One can only hope that we shall be preserved a little longer from the impertinence of such honesty as Professor Liljegren expects of a writer ; when everyone who publishes his views on a matter of general interest exposes all his motives, the world of letters will be as indecent as the most modern of us can desire. (6)

(1) JOHN PHILLIPS, *The Life of Mr. John Milton*, (DARBISHIRE, *op. cit.*, p. 23).

(2) EDWARD PHILLIPS, *The Life of Mr. John Milton*, (DARBISHIRE, *op. cit.*, p. 65).

(3) *Op. cit.*, M. L. R., XXVI (1931), p. 398.

(4) *Ibid.*

(5) He cannot bear to be as frank and direct about it as Tillyard is : « That Milton conveys a false impression by saying nothing about his own marriage and its effect on his ideas on divorce is obvious ; I doubt whether any one could be persuaded that Milton would have written his divorce pamphlets just when he did, but for this disaster. » (*Milton*, p. 109). And cf. Raleigh, *op. cit.*, pp. 48-49.

(6) *Op. cit.*, p. 398.

Of course Liljegren never asked that. He never asked of Milton or of any other great author that he write his "Confessions". Nobody asked Milton for his motives. Milton offers them. But if of two kinds of motives — such as are present in most human actions — he never mentions those that are not sure to contribute to his greatness, then we must agree with Hanford when he says, with regard to another question of the same sort (1): "In any case, there is a misleading suppression of a part of his full mind, which we may regard as a characteristic manifestation of Miltonic strategy." (2)

On the other hand, we must admit that Liljegren, in his interpretation of the facts, is too severe in his judgement upon Milton: "An unfounded display of acquaintance with a celebrity", "ambition to obtain public employment (3)", "a somewhat showy afterthought intended for public exhibition (4)". Where Liljegren sees vanity and ambition, I see only the rationalizer's need to justify himself, to combat his complex of immaturity, to show that the Commonwealth had a Latin Secretary who was worthy of his position.

Here is Wright's conclusion about the whole question, made apropos of the rectified date of Milton's marriage. He makes indignant answer to Liljegren, to Dr. Johnson and the rest of those who would see ground for criticism in all these "misleading suppressions":

But what seems to me no less important, is that it [the correction of the date of Milton's marriage (5)] puts Milton's character in a fairer light. We get a story of the marriage in which Milton shows, not as both knave and fool, but as a victim of events who was to prove magnanimous in forgiving and helping those responsible for the indignity and suffering he had to endure. Above all, the new date disposes of that grotesque legend of the writing of the first divorce tract [while his wife Mary must still have been with him]. There are many such scandals about the "puritan poet" which the world, suspicious and prejudiced, has been too ready first to believe and then to judge him by: he lied vaingloriously about the date of his return from Italy and about meeting Galileo there, dissembled the politic or sinister motives behind his pamphlets, fraudently inserted a prayer into the *Eikon Basiliké* in order to abuse the dead King, dealt harshly with his mother-in-law and bullied his daughters. From such stories derives the common idea of Milton; as J. S. Smart used to say, anyone would think the man to have been a kind of ogre — and a ludicrous kind at that. But the most notorious of these scandals, giving colour and warrant to the rest, is

(1) *q. supra*, p. 70.

(2) *Youth of Milton*, p. 130.

(3) *Op. cit.*, p. 36.

(4) *Op. cit.*, p. 16.

(5) The earlier date (1642) proposed by Smart and carefully argued by Wright, would do away with the old accusation that Milton wrote his divorce treatises while his young wife was still in his house. This is very important for Wright's defence of Milton's character; it does not touch the question discussed here, whether his personal desire for a divorce sharpened and weighted his arguments for new divorce laws in England.

that of the first divorce tract : its refutation should make us wary of the others, check the industry in inventing fresh ones, and help us to recover a portrait of the man less at variance with the testimony of those who knew and respected him. » (1)

It is not helpful to understanding to group, as Wright does, all the accusations against Milton together, and answer them *en masse*. There are large ones and small ones, false ones and true ones. Those which touch his personal life are almost always false. We cannot impute to Milton any action that he would himself have considered as evil. But Wright has not disproved that in his way of presenting facts Milton contrived to give them always the special colour he desired ; and that by his eloquence or his silences he felt free to suppress some of them and to alter the proportions, relations, or implications, or others. A party pamphleteer cannot love the truth for itself. As Guizot said, and Guizot knew political life all too well from the inside, « le fanatisme ment » (2).

7.

IDENTITIES.

a) When Milton made his official reply to the *Eikon Basiliké*, he took no account of the possibility (today a certainty) (3) that King Charles I was not the author of it. As Masson (4) says of a passage which he quotes from the *Eikonoklastes* : « It seems impossible that Milton could have written this if he was not still under the impression that Charles was or might have been the author of the *Eikon*. »

If often happens that the excellent Masson brings up short before a fact of which, from a moral point of view, he cannot permit himself to perceive the bearing. He seems to have seen everything, but he has not drawn the conclusions from everything. When the conclusion would embarrass him in his ideal portraiture of his hero, he prefers (unconsciously, no doubt) to say that the thing he sees before him is impossible. No one has ever known Milton better than Masson. He has an extraordinary intuition to supplement his boundless industry and erudition, but before the « impossible » fact his Scottish morality recoils.

The anonymous pamphlet *Eikon Aléthiné : The Portraiture of Truth's*

(1) *Op. cit.*, M. L. R., XXVII, (1932), p. 23.

(2) F. P. G. GUIZOT, *Histoire de la République d'Angleterre*, Paris, Didier, 1854, I, p. 95.

(3) *Op. supra*, p. 24.

(4) IV, p. 249.

most sacred Majesty, truly suffering, but not solely ; wherein the false colours are washed off wherewith the Paper-stainer had bedaubed Truth, the late King, and the Parliament, in his Counterfeit piece, entitled *Eikon Basiliké* : published to undeceive the world, had appeared on the 16th of August, almost two months before the publication of Milton's reply to the *Eikon* (1). It denied that the King was the author of the « King's Book », and attempted to prove that it was the work of an English divine or prelate. It seems still more « impossible » that Milton, working on his *Eikonoklastes*, should not have seen this volume, so important for his study. Besides, two or three times in the course of the book, he showed that he was familiar with such theories ; as when he says : (2)

But as to the author of these soliloquies, whether it were undoubtedly the late king, as it is believed, or any secret coadjutor, and some stick not to name him.

But Milton never permits this possibility of a doubt to let the King off the responsibility for the Pamela Prayer.

b) As to the *Eikon*, we may perhaps admit that Milton was far from being sure that the King was not its author. But in his controversy with Morus, on the contrary, Milton received direct information that Morus was not the author of *Regii Sanguinis Clamor ad Coelum*, published (probably in August) in 1652 by Ulac at The Hague (3).

In the beginning Milton may well have believed in Morus's authorship, which was hinted at in the very first allusion made to the work, according to Masson, in England. In the number of *Mercurius Politicus* for the 23rd-30th September, 1652, the Leyden correspondent mentions Morus (4) as the probable author of the *Clamor*. And others took it up (5). But as early as October, Milton's friend Hartlib received a letter from Ulac, the printer, affirming that Morus was not the author ; and when Ulac put out an edition of Milton's *Defensio Secunda* at The Hague in 1654, he stated in the preface that he had received an answer to his letter from Hartlib on October 29th, 1652, from which he quotes this sentence : « I am glad that you have told me that Morus is not the author of that most vile and scandalous book. » (6) It appears evident that Hartlib himself, that excellent friend of Milton's to whom he dedicated *On Education*, was convinced, and he must certainly have spoken of his correspon-

(1) MASSON, IV, p. 130.

(2) *S. M.*, p. 778.

(3) MASSON, IV, p. 453.

(4) MASSON, IV, p. 459.

(5) MASSON, IV, p. 463.

(6) MASSON, IV, p. 467, 627.

ondence with Ulac to Milton, who was then preparing his reply.

Masson asks why Milton should have felt under obligation to believe the simple affirmation of that Ulac whom he attacks so ferociously in the *Defensio Secunda* and tries to demolish as a witness, why he should have gone against « the universal belief in Holland and the letters of private information which he receives » (1). Masson, however, does not quote these letters, but quotes instead some letters written by certain Dutch scholars to one of their colleagues in Florence, which indicate that this belief was far from universal in Holland. It is evident from them that as early as October or November well-informed persons in Holland were saying that although the regicides attributed the book to Morus, it appeared that it was really the work of a certain Englishman. Here are a few quotations from these letters, chosen by Masson himself from the *Burmanni Sylloge Epistolarum* : (2)

Vossius to Heinsius, 18 Oct., 1652 : « It [*Regii sanguinis Clamor*] seems to have been written by an anonymous Englishman, but transmitted to Salmasius, and published by the Ethiop (a nickname for Morus-Moor). »

Ulitiis to Heinsius, 8th Nov., 1652 : « A book has lately come out called *Clamor Regii Sanguinis ad Coelum*. The English, thinking Morus the author, have overhauled him severely in a late number of a newspaper. » (3) (This must be the famous copy of *Mercurius Politicus* of 23rd-30th Sept., 1652.)

Heinsius (from Florence) to Gronovius, 7th January 1653 (evidently the reply to the former) :

I had understood the *Clamor Regii Sanguinis* to be by some Englishman, but edited by Morus. The «Parricides» however, consider Morus the author of that book, and have been very hard upon him in the London gazettes, on the assumption of his having seduced Alastor's [Sau-maise's] waiting-maid, adding this epigram... (4)

(Heinsius adds the Latin epigram, published in the said number of *Mercurius Politicus*.)

This brings us to the activities of Milton himself. He began to busy himself, probably towards the end of 1653, with his reply to Morus, or more precisely, to the *Regii Sanguinis Clamor*. Masson supposes that the total absence of his name from the Orders of Council, from the dissolution of the Barebones Parliament down to June, 1654,

(1) IV, p. 627.

(2) IV, p. 465, Note I.

(3) MASSON, IV, p. 464.

(4) MASSON, IV, p. 474.

indicates that he had been freed from his work as Latin Secretary in order to devote himself to this new task (1).

Milton's adversaries seem often to have been the victims of bad luck. Morus at that moment was struggling against infinite difficulties. He was deep in the scandal brought on by his relations with Pontia, a serving-maid in Salmasius's household, and his lawsuit with M^{me} Sau-maise about this affair must have been sufficiently embarrassing for a pastor and professor of religious history. He had just escaped condemnation when John Durie (2) (a Scottish friend of Milton's who had been appointed by the new government librarian at St. James's Palace) (3) informed him in April at Amsterdam that Milton's pamphlet against him was about to appear. Morus, who at that time wished for nothing so much as to be forgotten, was distracted at this news but had no difficulty in convincing Durie that he was not the author of the *Clamor*. Durie at once wrote two letters to Milton, to dissuade him from publishing his attack. Here are two phrases which Masson quotes from them, as given by Milton himself in his *Pro Se Defensio* : (4)

Durie [from The Hague] to Milton 14-24 April, 1654 :

I have been informed by a Middleburg minister, who is very familiar with Morus, that Morus is not the author of that book, but a certain French minister, whose name Morus gave him under promise of secrecy.

Durie [from Amsterdam] to Milton 19-29 April, 1654 :

I have conversed with Mr. Hotton [minister of the French Church in Amsterdam] who is a very keen royalist, and extremely intimate with Morus ; and he told me, what I wrote to you in my former letter, that Morus is not the author of *Clamor Regii Sanguinis*.

Morus, who wished to neglect no possible chance in his favour, induced the Dutch Ambassador in London to make representations to Thurloe, the general secretary of the Council. The ambassador did so officially, in the presence of his colleague M. de Beverning (5).

Praying him with the most serious earnestness to be so good as to speak of the matter to his Highness without delay.

(1) IV, p. 540-580.

(2) MASSON, IV, 228-29, 448, 630-31.

(3) MASSON, IV, p. 229.

(4) *Pro se Defensio*, quoted in translation by MASSON, IV, p. 631.

Ex Literis Duraei. Haga, April 14-24, 1654, Quod ad responsum Milioni ad eum librum, cui titulus Regii Sanguinis Clamor : equidem a ministro quodam Middelburgensi, qui Mori per familiaris est, certior sum factus, Morum non esse illius libri authorem, sed ministrum quandam Gallicum, quem Morus sub conditione silentii eidem nominavit.

Et ex alteris Amsterodamo, April 19-29, 1654. Cum D. Ottono colloquutus sum ; hic quidem acerrimè regius est, et Moro perquam intimus ; idque mihi dixit, quod superioribus literis ad tes cripsi, Morum non esse « Clamoris Regii Sanguinis » authorem.

(P. W., p. 735.)

(5) The Ambassador's letter to Morus of 23rd June-6th July, 1654, from which we quote sentences, is presented in full by Masson, IV, p. 632.

The Ambassador, desirous on his part of leaving no stone unturned, requested also of two gentlemen, friends of his who were well acquainted with Milton :

to represent to him the reasons for which we desired, in the present juncture of time and affairs, that he should not publish the book we had been assured he had written against another entitled *Clamor Regii Sanguinis*, or at least that he should not do you the wrong of attributing that work to you... These gentlemen brought me word a few days afterwards that he had so strong an impression that it was no other than you that was the author that they could by no means dissuade him...

Thereupon the Ambassador returned to the charge with Thurloe, communicating to him a copy of Morus's letter. But at that point Morus had another stroke of bad luck. There came to light, on the 20th of May, a plot against Cromwell's life, and, as the ambassador said :

They were so occupied that they could attend to nothing else. [Here is his conclusion on the matter] : I am very sorry that, after the most violent spirits among those of the Naval Service have accommodated themselves to the Peace [the Peace signed 27th April between Cromwell and the Dutch] *one who makes profession of letters and sciences* (1), *which raise men above the vulgar*, has chosen, notwithstanding our request, to show so little moderation.

The phrase herein underlined seems to the present writer most important for making a judgement upon Milton at this time. Here is an ambassador, accustomed to judge of character, hardened to the opposition and intransigence which he must have encountered from the heads of states, and to the arrogance of the Admiralty of a young republic that had begun to dispute the sovereignty of the seas with the Netherlands, and such a man is shocked at Milton's harshness.

Aubrey, in commenting on this point, indulges in unwonted criticism of Milton :

From Mr. Abr. Hill : memorandum : his sharp writing against Alexander More of Holland upon a mistake, notwithstanding he had given him by the Ambassador all satisfaction to the contrary, viz that the book (called *Clamor*) was writt by Peter du Moulin. Well, that was all one, he having writt it, it should goe into the world. One of them was as bad as the other. (2)

The historic date to which the Ambassador makes indirect allusion provides a fixed point in following the order of events. The discovery of the plot which, according to the Ambassador, was posterior to his activities in behalf of Morus, was May 20th. Milton's book,

(1) Italics mine.

(2) DARBISHIRE, *op. cit.*, p. 14-15. The reader is reminded that Aubrey here goes beyond the facts. Milton did not yet know, if he ever did, who the real author was.

Joannis Miltoni Angli pro Populo Anglicano Defensio Secunda : Contra Infamem Libellum ad Coelum Anonymum, cui titulus, Regii Sanguinis Clamor, adversus Parricidas Anglicanos, was published May 30th. The Ambassador's efforts, then, did not come too late. Milton still had time to suppress the personal paragraphs against Morus.

To complete the documentation, there must be added a letter quoted by Masson, addressed to Morus by an anonymous correspondent, who wrote shortly after his arrival in London on August 7th : (1)

At my arrival here I found Milton's book so public that I perceived it was impossible to suppress it. This man has been told that you were not the author of the book which he refuted, to which he answered that he was at least assured that you had caused it to be imprinted, that you had writ the preface, and he believes some of the Verses that are in it (2), and that is enough to justify him for setting upon you. He doth also add he is very angry that he did not know several things which he hath heard since, being far worse, as he says than any he put forth in his book ; but he doth reserve them for another, if so be you answer this.

After all this, we have reason to be somewhat surprised to read in a letter from Milton, dated a month earlier, on July 6th : (3)

You have expressed some doubt as to his identity ; but on previous, occasions on which we have discussed the question, at a time when you had recently returned from Holland, you never appeared to have any doubt of the author's being Morus [*nulla tibi de autore dubitatio subesse videbatur*] ; such was, indeed, you told me, the general opinion in that country, nor was any other name suggested. If you have since acquired any other information, I beg you to tell me of it.

Milton was, consequently, well-informed. He had been advised privately and officially by his friends and by a foreign ambassador. He must have known the truth, that is, that Morus was not the author. We are forced to conclude that the literal truth in this matter seemed to Milton of less importance than the useful weapon which he had in his hands. A name is precious, a personal attack has emotional value. Even if certain initiated persons knew that the author could not be Morus, even if Milton himself could hardly cherish a doubt on the subject, it remained nevertheless true that the general public supposed Morus to be the man. Every attack which carried against Morus would carry against the cause of the enemies of the Commonwealth ; Morus, because of the recent scandal, was an excellent target, and his very name lent itself to various plays upon words ; a vic-

(1) MASSON, IV p. 633.

(2) This was true. v. MASSON, V, p. 215.

(3) To Henry OLDENBURG, agent for Bremen to the English Parliament, to whom Milton had sent a copy of the *Second Defence* (MASSON, IV, p. 625-26) ; cf. P. W. p. 836, TILLYARD, *Corresp.*, p. 29.

tory over Morus would be equivalent in the public mind to a powerful argument against the *Regii Sanguinis Clamor* itself. Moreover, the attack upon Morus was already written and ready for the printer, and it was very effective. Milton did not hesitate but published it as it stood.

Meanwhile Milton's attack on Morus served to distract public suspicion from the real author, Peter du Moulin, who was safe in England at the time and was laughing in his sleeve (1). He recounted, not without humour, his version of the affair in 1670, in a Latin work entitled *Petri Molinaei P.-F. Parerga : Poematum Libelli Tres*, from which Masson gives some extracts in translation : (2)

I had sent my manuscript sheets to the great Salmasius, who entrusted them to the care of that most learned man, Alexander Morus. This Morus delivered them to the printer, and prefixed to them an epistle to the King, in the printer's name, exceedingly eloquent and full of good matter. When that care of Morus over the business of printing the book had become known to Milton through the spies of the regicides in Holland, Milton held it as an ascertained fact that Morus was the author of the *Clamor* ; whence that most virulent book of Milton's against Morus, entitled *Defensio Secunda pro Populo Anglicano*. It had the effect, moreover, of making enemies for Morus in Holland ; for at that time the English tyrants were very much feared in foreign parts. Meanwhile I looked on in silence, and not without a soft chuckle, at seeing my bantering laid at another man's door... And, as Milton preferred my getting off scatheless to being found in a ridiculous position himself, I had this reward for my pains, that Milton, whom I had treated so roughly, turned out my patron and sedulous body-guard.

Milton always held to his position, and never admitted that he had made a mistake of judgement in this matter. In his *Pro se Defensio* (3), published fifteen months after the *Defensio Secunda*, he tries to defend his belief in Morus's authorship but adds nothing to what has been stated above. He declares again (as was perfectly true) that if Morus was not the author of the *Clamor* he had at any rate a share in the responsibility for its seeing the light, and that he had been assured that the « general opinion » was that Morus was the author. But Milton was the last person to be influenced by public opinion against that of the few persons whom he trusted. We cannot believe that he credited the « general opinion » in preference to that of Hartlib and Durie. But he could use it. And while it is quite true that Morus had a certain responsibility in the publication of the *Clamor* and was probably the author of the preface, yet Milton was not content to attack

(1) MASSON, V, p. 220.

(2) V, p. 219-21.

(3) MASSON, V, p. 199.

him merely for that degree of responsibility which was his. He desired to discredit the book in discrediting the author of it. If he had to admit that Morus was not the author, then he had no author to attack. He knew that a dry criticism of the argument, even though destructive, would be far less powerful than the violent and vulgar abuse of a hero of several scandals.

What Morus himself says in his *Fides Publica*, published in 1654, is only partly true : (1)

... Will you hear a word of truth ? You had certainly learnt the fact, and cannot for two whole years have been ignorant of it. But, as you perceived it would not suit your convenience to vent your spleen against an anonymous opponent, that is a nobody, and some definite person must be pitched upon as an adversary to bear your rage expressly, no one else seemed to you more opportune than I as an object of calumny, whether because you heard that I had many enemies, though (what proves their savageness) without any cause, who would hold up both thumbs in applause of your jocosities, or because you knew that by the arts of a Juno [M^{me} Saumaise] I was involved in a lawsuit, more troublesome in reality than dangerous, and you did not believe that I should be, as I have been, the winner before all the tribunals... Your book once written, Morus must of necessity stand for your opponent, or Milton, the Defender of the People, would have done nothing in two years ! He would have lost all the laborious compilation of his days and nights, all his punnings upon my name, all his sarcasms on my sacred office and profession... For, if you had taken out of your book all the reproaches thrown at me, how little there would have been, certainly not more than a few pages remaining for your « People » !

Liljegren is glad to accept the explanation of Du Moulin and Aubrey for Milton's obstinacy in insisting to the last on Morus's authorship of the *Clamor*, that it was vanity, an inability to admit publicly that he had been wrong. It suits Liljegren's interpretation of Milton's character, his ascription to it of Caesarism and Machiavellism. But, as I have already said above and at more length elsewhere (2), this is not my reading of Milton, and I do not see in him either Caesarian or Machiavellian traits. I hold Morus's explanation to be the true one : « that without the pages of abuse of the supposed author, Milton's second Defense of the English People would have been comparatively weak and uninteresting. » But where Morus sees only harshness and wounded vanity, a man of letters cheated of a personal success, I believe that it was in the light of precious missiles in a sacred cause, that Milton could not bear to see his arguments weakened.

But whatever his motives, his use of equivocation seems to be an established fact.

(1) MASSON, V, pp. 151, 158-50.

(2) *De Comus à Satan*, Partie III, Ch. IV, 1.

Yet it is not a question here of condemning Milton, as Liljegren is inclined to do ; merely of noting a difference between two periods of his life. Truth in itself, absolute truth, had lost for the Latin Secretary some of the importance it had always had for the man and poet. A truth which is not known, and is not so acceptable to the public, does not represent an active political force ; an untruth which everyone believes, is superior as a means to an end. The mystical value of truth in itself had disappeared for Milton, at least in political controversy. It kept, for political purposes, only its pragmatismal value ; "if it worked, it was « truth in action ».

c) A curious footnote to the history of Milton's controversy with Morus concerning the authorship of the *Clamor* is the account of his dealings with a certain Jean Labadie, who in 1659 aroused Milton's interest and sympathy. Labadie was a former Jesuit, whose case presents certain analogies with that of Morus. A dubious personage who seems to have caused scandal wherever he went, whose religiosity turned readily towards sexual incontinence, he left scandalous stories behind him all over France, from Amiens to Abbeville, from Bazas to Toulouse, until he settled at Montauban, where his reputation as mystic and prophet had preceded him. There he publicly abjured the Catholic faith and became a Protestant parson. He lived there several years much respected by the Protestants, but in open enmity with the Catholics, his quarrels with whom finally drove him out. He took refuge in Orange, where he had a temporary pastorate (1).

It was in that city that this renegade visionary received a letter from John Milton, « to Jean Labadie, pastor at Orange », proposing to him the post of French pastor in London (2). Masson is somewhat surprised but not at all dismayed at this proposal coming from Milton :

It is clear from this letter that Milton had never heard of the scandals against Labadie's moral character, or, if he had, utterly disbelieved them, and regarded him simply as a convert from Roman Catholicism whose passionate and aggressive Protestant fervour had brought intolerable and unjust persecution upon him in France. Durie was his informant ; and, for all we can now know, Milton's judgement about Labadie may have been the right one, and the traditional French account of him to this day may be wrong. It is certainly strange, however, to find Milton befriending with so much readiness and zeal this French Protestant Minister, against whom there were exactly such scandals abroad as those which he had himself believed and blazoned about Morus, for the murder of Morus's reputation over Europe, and his ruin in the French Protestant Church in particular. (3)

(1) MASSON, V, pp. 591-92.

(2) TILLYARD, *Correspondence*. p. 47.

(3) MASSON, V, p. 594.

Masson here shows his usual strange mixture of perspicacity and *naïveté*. He will not see clearly for himself, but he puts the glass to our eyes. That same Durie, whom Milton refused to credit with regard to Morus, even when confirmed by his friend Hartlib, Ulac and the Dutch Ambassador, seems to have been his sole source of information concerning Labadie. Milton accepts his account without hesitation, even against the « general opinion ».

Milton the party worker certainly had no prejudice against renegades. (And from a certain point of view he was right, since renegades often make the best tools.) But the analogies and contrasts between these two cases are striking and instructive for the study of Milton in his capacity of servant of the Commonwealth. Concerning Morus, he resolutely neglected precise information he received so as to be able to publish a widespread scandal which served his immediate purpose ; concerning Labadie, he accepted precise information (from the same source) which permitted him to take no account of a scandal of similar nature, equally widespread, which it is difficult to believe he had never heard of. (The Roundheads' intelligence service was excellent).

This parallel confirms the belief that in the realm of politics, absolute truth had abdicated its complete sway over Milton. Relative truth had its uses when it could serve the Cause.

8.

THE HUNDRED JACOBUSES.

In the list of those Orders in Council which concern Milton, the one (1) that indicates that he had received a sum of money as a reward for his reply to Salmasius shows that the indication of the sum rendered has been partly effaced, to leave place for a simple formula of thanks (2). Liljegren's interpretation of this curious transaction appears very probable : (3)

These precautions of the Revolutionists against uncalled-for investigation of their public records are seen in another instance that lend support to this explanation of Simmons's crossed entry : (4)

In 1649, the celebrated Salmasius launched a vituperative pamphlet

(1) No. 25, *op. supra*, p. 15

(2) Masson, IV, p. 321.

(3) *Op. cit.*, p. 87, Note 3.

(4) *op. supra*, p. 22.

against the revolutionaries on account of their execution of Charles I. Milton was ordered to answer and did so with equal vigour. Among other things, he — without cause — accused Salmasius of having received money from Charles II for his service. Now, to Milton himself a sum was apparently paid for *his* book, as is seen in the following entry : — That thanks be given to Mr. Milton, on behalf of the Commonwealth, for his good service done in writing an answer to the book of Salmasius, written against the proceedings of the Commonwealth of England : *And it is ordered that ye sum of... hundred pounds be given to him as a reward from this Council for his... Salmasius.* » (Council Order Book, June 18th, 1651.) (1)

But as it would not do if it were generally known that Milton, while exposing Salmasius as a paid defender of Charles, was himself being paid for *his* defence, the above passage is cancelled and the lines in italics so thoroughly deleted that a few words were really indecipherable. The whole is replaced by the following :

« The Council, taking notice of the many good services performed by Mr. John Milton, their Secretary for Foreign Languages, to this State and Commonwealth, particularly of his book in vindication of the Parliament and People of England against the calumnies and invectives of Salmasius, have thought fit to declare their resentment and good acceptance of the same, and that the thanks of the Council be returned to Mr. Milton, and their sense represented in that behalf. » It is evident that there was no need to *delete* that part of the former entry which mentioned the sum of money if there had been no fear of espionage. Cf. also the fact that, on the eve of the Restoration (in the spring of 1660) the Commons voted that several passages in their journals of 1649 should be deleted and rendered illegible, as, in fact, they were. (see *C. J.*, 1649, 1660, pass.).

But if Liljegen is right, then what are we to think of the following declaration made by Milton two years later in the *Defensio Secunda* and addressed to Morus : « Do you, Sir, know that my hands were never soiled with the guilt of peculation, and that I never was even a shilling the richer by those exertions which you most vehemently traduce ? » (2)

It is interesting to place beside these quotations the passages in the two « Defences » where Milton accuses Salmasius of having accepted a sum of money for his book in defence of the King. His ferocity in throwing the hundred jacobusses in Salmasius's face sharpens our curiosity with regard to the effaced figure in the Order in Council which indicated the number of pounds he received for his reply to that work :

O mercenary and chargeable advocate ! could you not afford to write « a defence of Charles, the father, whom you pretend to be the best of kings,

(1) *v. supra*, p. 15.

(2) БОНН, I, p. 243. « ...tuque scito, me illas « opimitates » atque « opes » quas mihi exprobas, non attigisse, neque eo nomine quo maxime accusas, obolo factum ditiores ». (*P. W.*, p. 715).

to Charles the son, the most indigent of all kings, but it must be at the poor King's own charge ? But though you are a knave, you would not make yourself ridiculous, in calling it the King's defence ; for you having sold it, it is no longer yours, but the King's indeed ; who bought it at the price of a hundred Jacobusses, a great sum for a poor king to disburse. I know very well what I say : and it is well enough known who brought the gold, and the purse wrought with beads : we know who saw you reach out greedy fists, under pretence of embracing the King's chaplain, who brought the present, but indeed to embrace the present itself, and by accepting it to exhaust almost all the King's treasury (1).

But why should I promise you barley, that never pecked at corn, as that honest plain cock that we read of in Aesop, but at gold, as that rogue cock in Plautus, though with a different event ; for you found a hundred Jacobuses, and he was struck dead with Euclio's club, which you deserve more than he did (2).

For you had not then run mad ; you had not then been bribed with Charles's Jacobuses. You had not got the King's evil (3).

But now it is apparent, that you have undertaken the defence of this royal cause, not so much out of your own inclination, as partly because you were hired, and that at a good round price, too, considering how things are with him that set you on work (4).

And now we are extremely pleased with your Anglicisms : ...County Court, the Turne, Hundreds ; you have quickly learnt to count your hundred Jacobuses in English (5).

How many zones you observed in that golden and silken heaven of the King's, I know not ; but I know you got one zone [a purse] well tempered with a hundred golden stars by your astronomy (6).

Whether Salmasius ever received the hundred Jacobuses or not, and we have no means of knowing whether Milton invented his accusation (7), the episode indicates something equivocal and distorted

(1) Preface to the *Defence of the English People*. (BOHN, I, p. 7).

O te venalem oratorem et sumptuosum ! Siccine defensionem pro Carolo patre, tuâ sententiâ, rege optimo, ad Carolum filium regem pauperrimum noluisti, nisi sumptibus regis ? Sed veterator etiam haud irridiculus esse voluisti, qui regiam defensionem dixeris ; non enim amplius tua quam vendidisti, sed legitime jam regia defensio est ; centenis nimirum Jacobaeis emta, ingenti pretio ab egentissimo rege : non enim ignota loquimur ; novimus qui illos aureos domum attulit tuam, qui crumenam illam tessellis vitreis variatam, novimus qui te avaras manus porrigentem vidit, in speciem quidem ut Sacellanum regis missum cum munere, re vera ut ipsum munus amplecterere ; et una tantum mercede accepta totum pene regis ærarium exinanires. (P. W., p. 650.)

(2) BOHN, I, p. 115. « Sed quid ego tibi hordeum ? qui non hordeum, ut Aesopius ille, simplex et frugi gallus, sed aurum, ut Plautinus ille nequam, sculpturiendo quæsisti ; quamvis exitu adhuc dispari ; tu enim centum Jacobæos aureos inde reperisti, cum Euclionis fuste potius, quo misellus ille Plautinus, obtruncari dignior sis ». (P. W., p. 678).

(3) BOHN, I, p. 115. « ...nondum enim insaniebas, nondum Carolinis Jacobaeis delinitus et deauratus in morbum regium incideras ». (P. W., p. 678).

(4) BOHN, I, p. 158. « Nunc satis constat non tam tuopte ingenio ad causam regiam adjecisse te animum, quam partim pretio, pro ejus, qui te conduxit, copia maximo. » (P. W., p. 690).

(5) BOHN, I, p. 169. « Jam Anglicismis tuis magnopere delectamur ; *Countie Court, The Turne, hundreda* ; mira nempe docilitate centenos Jacobæos tuos Anglice numerare didicisti. » (P. W., p. 693).

(6) BOHN, I, p. 187. « Quot zonas in illo regis aureo et serico cœlo observaveris, nescio : hoc scio, te zonam unam, centum stellis aureis bene temperatam, ex illa tua cœlesti contemplatione abstulisse. » (P. W., p. 698).

(7) LILJEGEN merely affirms that Milton made it « without cause, (loc. cit.), while MASSON (IV, p. 166), is probably repeating what Milton said.

in Milton's processes of thinking. Unless we are to accept Masson's simple-hearted and obviously invented explanation :

There is but one possible interpretation of this passage in the Council Order Book. The Council, in Milton's absence, first voted him their thanks and a sum of money ; but, before the meeting was over, it was intimated to the Council, either by Milton in person or by message from him, that he would not accept any money reward, and so the Council changed their minute, voting him their thanks only, but doing so more comprehensively and emphatically. Apart from Milton's natural magnanimity, it was utterly impossible that he should accept a money-reward for his book after what he had said about Salmasius and his hundred Jacobuses (1).

But it is well to remember in this connection that Milton's friendship for Needham and his tolerance towards Dugard and even Hills did not prevent his abusing Saumaise as a (2) « crafty turncoat ».

Both Milton and Salmasius earned thoroughly the money they are said to have received from their respective official literary tasks, and such payments seem not to have been infrequent (3). The erasure from the Council Book seems proof that Milton was ashamed of his own recompense in the matter. Did he then impute to Salmasius a fault he was ashamed of in himself ? Or, worse still, did he have the erasure made so as to leave him free to attack an adversary for something he had permitted himself to do ? In any case, it seems difficult to explain away the equivocation.

9.

OPPORTUNISM.

« That Milton approved of Cromwell's *coup d'état* of April 20, 1653, dissolving the Rump of the Long Parliament, appears abundantly... » says Masson (4). This is to admit a considerable shift of opinion on Milton's part, and a good deal of inconsistency with earlier expressed attitudes. It is easy to collect a great number of quotations from his prose which appear to condemn in advance any such event (5). But we know that he did not regard Cromwell as above criticism, from the

(1) IV, p. 322.

(2) BOHN, I, p. 14. « O vatrum et versipellem ! ». (*P. W.*, p. 652).

(3) Cf. the following Order in Council for Jan. 8, 1649-50 : « That £ 100 be paid unto Mr. Thomas Waring for his pains and charges in compiling a book containing several examinations of the Bloody Massacre in Ireland. » (MASSON, IV, p. 151).

(4) IV, p. 519.

(5) For example, *Eikonoklastes* (*S. M.*, pp. 795, 807, 815-17), *Apology for Smectymnuus* (*S. M.*, p. 555), and *A Defense of the People of England*. (BOHN I p. 6, *P. W.*, p. 649).

passage in the *Second Defence* in which he indicated the dangers of Cromwell's dictatorship under the guise of eloquent and heroic advice (1).

But what did seem open to criticism, and perhaps even disturbed Masson a little (2), was the apparent rapidity of Milton's conversion and his immediate defence of Cromwell's act in *A Letter to a Gentleman in the Country, touching the Dissolution of the Late Parliament and the Reasons thereof*, attributed to Milton by Thomason and Masson (3). But now, thanks to the researches of Professor P. S. Havens (4), we no longer have to consider Milton as the author of this letter, nor are we obliged to assume that his acceptance of the *coup d'état* was necessarily immediate. We know that he was not blind to its dangers.

But opportunism was not foreign to Milton's character. That is an inevitable conclusion from the present study. His views had never the uncompromising single-mindedness of Lilburne's (5).

A striking example is Milton's acceptance of the restoration of the Rump Parliament, when the army chiefs, Lambert, Desborough and Fleetwood succeeded in forcing Richard Cromwell to dissolve his Parliament in April, 1659 (6). Making common cause with the « Old Republicans » and the supporters of the « Good Old Cause », they restored what remained of that Rump that had been dissolved by Cromwell's *coup d'état* of April 23, 1653, without protest from Milton. Three weeks later Richard abdicated, and the new Parliament was master of the situation.

This represented a defeat for the « Court Party », which desired to make Richard's Protectorate an avowed continuation of his father's ; it included Thurloe and other members of the Council, Whitlocke and Ingoldsby, and had the backing of Lord Broghill and Henry Cromwell. It was the party which probably had Milton's sympathies and which Masson believes he would have preferred had he been forced to choose between it and the « Army Party » (or « Wallingford House » group) (7). But his friends Vane and Bradshaw, Whitlocke and Fairfax, were members of the restored Parliament and Milton

(1) Bohn, I, pp. 288-91 ; *P. W.*, p. 729.

(2) IV, pp. 605-08.

(3) IV, pp. 520-23.

(4) *A Tract Long Attributed to Milton* (*Huntington Library Bulletin* N° 6, Harvard University Press, 1934), pp. 109-14. Havens shows that the author must have been John Hall. Even the subtitle of a tract known to be by Hall : (*A True Account and Character of the Times, 1647*) seems to corroborate this hypothesis : « ...drawn by a Gentleman to Give Satisfaction to a Friend in the Country ». (Havens cites this work, but without drawing attention to the similarity in the wording).

(5) P. D. M. WOLFE: *Milton, Lilburne and the People*, *M. P.*, XXXI (February, 1934), pp. 253-72.

(6) MASSON, V, p. 442.

(7) V, p. 577-78. But MASSON wonders whether this would have been equally true, had Milton not been incapacitated by his infirmity : « How far was his present Cromwellianism the actual consequence of his blindness, the mere submissiveness of a blind man to what he had no power to disturb ? » (*loc. cit.*).

went over to it at once, continuing as secretary of the new administration.

In August he addressed a pamphlet (1) to this Parliament, couched in flattering terms :

Owing to your protection, supreme Senate ! this liberty of writing, which I have used these eighteen years on all occasions to assert the just rights and freedoms both of church and state, and so far approved, as to have been trusted with the representment and defence of your actions to all Christendom against an adversary of no mean repute [Saumaise] ; to whom should I address what I still publish on the same argument, but to you, whose magnanimous counsels first opened and unbound the age from a double bondage under prelatical and regal tyranny... and thereby deserving of these nations, if they be not barbarously ungrateful, to be acknowledged, next under God, the authors and best patrons of religious and civil liberty, that ever these islands brought forth ? The care and tuition of whose peace and safety, *after a short and scandalous night of interruption* (2), is now again, by a new dawning of God's miraculous providence among us, revolved upon your shoulders.

What are we to understand by the striking phrase, « short and scandalous night of interruption » ? Masson, with his clear Scottish intelligence, finds immediately the most probable explanation, i. e., that the « scandalous night of interruption » must mean the period of Cromwell's rule, but rejects it at once, as not entirely creditable to his hero.

Let us, however, examine it carefully. Milton had been a warm partisan of the « Good Old Cause », of which the recall of the Rump Parliament is a reinstatement. Nevertheless, he is addressing a party which Cromwell overcame, and whose return to power is made possible by the death of the Protector and the fall of his son. What this party desires, then, is that everything should be put back as it was, as if the tyrant had never existed.

Milton in this pamphlet becomes once more the Milton of the early civil wars, and writes frankly on his favourite subject of the scandal of a paid clergy. Ignorance, laziness and cupidity must be punished, and the hirelings driven out. Under Cromwell he had not treated this subject so freely (3), but, Cromwell being no longer there, he returns to the attack. Milton was an idealist, but he worked always for what was immediately possible. What could be hoped for under Cromwell, he sought to realize. Now he can strive for that which Cromwell's disappearance from the scene renders once more possible. He was not one to hurl himself against obstacles ; when he wrote, it was

(1) *Considerations touching the Likeliest Means to Remove Hirelings out of the Church, wherein is also discoursed of Tithes, Church fees, and Church Revenues ; and whether any Maintenance of Ministers can be settled by Law* (S. M., p. 878).

(2) Italics mine.

(3) « Probably in nothing else had Cromwell wholly disappointed him. » (MASSON, V, p. 579).

with the hope of some tangible result. All the writings of his political years were really acts, which he weighed according to their promise of success. He must be considered as a strategist : a certain manœuvre which would have been excellent at the outset of a campaign, may be a great error later ; while another, which would have been a disastrous mistake in the beginning, turns out to be useful in a different situation. What counts is the result to be obtained, the force and position of the enemy, the means of action or propaganda, calculations whose accuracy must be determined by the event.

There are three possible objections to supposing that Milton could have applied those terms to the government of his « chief of men ».

1. Can a period of six years be characterized as short ? Masson says not, since it would be longer than the whole duration of the Commonwealth which it interrupted (1). But Milton is not comparing the « short and scandalous night » with the *ten* years that have passed since the foundation of the Commonwealth, but with the *eighteen* years that have gone by since the publication of his own first pamphlet : (2) « this liberty of writing which I have used these eighteen years », under the protection of the Parliament he is addressing. Six years may be considered brief in comparison with eighteen.

2. Might not the word « interruption » apply to something else ? Masson suggests that it indicates the usurpation of power by the officers of Wallingford House, that is, to the fortnight elapsed between Richard's fall and the restoration of the Rump (3). But how would the members of Parliament newly restored to power be likely to regard this latter interval ? It represented for them the overthrow of their adversary and their own recall. They would have recognized this period as short, but certainly not as scandalous. The words « scandalous night » would seem to have been remarkably ill-chosen for describing this episode to the very ones who had benefited by it.

But would they have been as ill-chosen as Masson believes, to indicate (when addressing those same members of Parliament) the six years of Cromwell's rule ? Masson himself shows on another page of his monumental work that they would on the contrary have seemed perfectly natural to his readers and to the Parliament :

The Wallingford-House magnates... concluded that... some kind of Parliament must be at once set up. — *But what Parliament ?* Here they had not far to seek. For the last month or more, placards on all the walls

(1) V, p. 606.

(2) *Of Reformation* (1641).

(3) « ... the fortnight or so of Wallingford-House usurpation which broke up Richard's Parliament and Protectorate, and from the continuance of which, with all the inconveniences of a mere military despotism, the restoration of the Rump had seemed a happy rescue. » (V, p. 607).

of London, the very cries of newsboys in the streets, had been telling them what Parliament. We have several times quoted the phrase « The Good Old Cause », as coming gradually into use after Oliver's death... But no one can describe now the force and frequency of that phrase in London and throughout England in April 1659... It meant, ...the pure Republican constitution which had been founded on the Regicide and which lasted till Cromwell's dissolution of the Rump on the 20th of April, 1653. It proclaimed *that Cromwell's Interim Dictatorship and Protectorate had been an interruption of the natural course of things...* calling on all men, now that Oliver was dead and his greatness gone with him, *to regard his rule as exceptional and extraordinary* and to revert to the old Commonwealth... A Parliament was wanted : what other Parliament could it be than the Rump restored ? *Let that very Assembly which Cromwell had dissolved...* resume their places now, *treat the six years of interval as a dream...* (1)

As my lamented friend Smart once said during a discussion of the date of Milton's first marriage : « Masson the biographer gives 1643 on one page as the date of the marriage, while on another page Masson the historian presents all the reasons why the circumstances of civil war would have made it impossible in that year. » (But Smart of course blinded himself almost in the same manner regarding the problem of the *Eikon* (2). These two erudite Scots were never at fault in their conclusions unless their worship of Milton's character was involved.)

3. If the objections to the word « short », and to the word « interruption » as applied to the Protectorate, do not hold, then Masson has only his moral argument left :

...It would be the most marvellous inconsistency on record if Milton had ever brought himself to call it [the Cromwellian Dictatorship and Protectorate] « scandalous ». Who had written the panegyric on Cromwell and his actually established Protectorate in the *Defensio Secunda* ? Who had been Oliver's Latin Secretary from first to last... ? (3)

But there is the very hub of the question. Milton's character was not so simple as his good biographer thought, and Masson of course had never mixed actively in politics.

(1) V. p. 444-445. Italics mine.

(2) *op. supra.* p. 32-49 ; 78.

(3) V, p. 606-07.

CONCLUSION.

Milton's critics, being naturally men of letters, have had a tendency to pass rapidly over the middle period of his life, if not actually to neglect it, as having produced few works of purely literary quality. The two writers who have on the contrary confined their study of the poet to this period (1) have not drawn from it conclusions directly serviceable to literary criticism, such as might show in detail the effects on his poetry of his prosaic labors for the Commonwealth.

But this neglectful attitude towards his years of political activity would not in the least have been Milton's own. The immense importance and value which they had for himself stand out clearly in the following passages from his prose works :

Relying on the divine assistance, they used every honourable exertion to break the yoke of slavery ; of the praise of which, though I claim no share to myself, yet I can easily repel any charge, which may be adduced against me, either of want of courage, or want of zeal. For though I did not participate in the toils or dangers of the war, yet I was at the same time engaged in a service not less hazardous to myself, and more beneficial to my fellow-citizens ; nor, in the adverse turns of our affairs, did I ever betray any symptoms of pusillanimity and dejection ; or show myself more afraid than became me, of malice or of death : For since from my youth I was devoted to the pursuits of literature and my mind had always been stronger than my body, I did not court the labours of a camp, in which any common person would have been of more service than myself, but resorted to that employment in which my exertions were likely to be of most avail. Thus, with the better part of my frame, I contributed as much as possible to the good of my country, and to the success of the glorious cause in which we were engaged ; and I thought, that if God willed the success of such glorious achievements, it was equally agreeable to his will, that there should be others by whom these achievements should be recorded with dignity and elegance ; and that the truth,

(1) LILJEGREN, and Mrs. RAYMOND.

which had been defended by arms, should also be defended by reason ; which is the best and only legitimate means of defending it. Hence, while I applaud those who were victorious in the field, I will not complain of the province which was assigned me ; but rather congratulate myself upon it, and thank the author of all good for having placed me in a station, which may be an object of envy to others, rather than of regret to myself. I am far from wishing to make any vain or arrogant comparisons, or to speak ostentatiously of myself, but, in a cause so great and glorious, and particularly on an occasion when I am called by the general suffrage to defend the very defenders of that cause ; I can hardly refrain from assuming a more lofty and swelling tone, than the simplicity of an exordium may seem to justify ; and much as I may be surpassed in the powers of eloquence, and copiousness of diction, by the illustrious orators of antiquity ; yet the subject of which I treat was never surpassed in any age, in dignity or in interest. It has excited such general and such ardent expectation, that I imagine myself not in the forum or on the rostra, surrounded only by the people of Athens or of Rome ; but about to address in this as I did in my former defence, the whole collective body of people, cities, states, and councils of the wise and eminent, through the wide expanse of anxious and listening Europe. I seem to survey as from a towering height, the far extended tracts of sea and land, and innumerable crowds of spectators, betraying in their looks the liveliest interest, and sensations the most congenial with my own... Surrounded by congregated multitudes, I now imagine, that, from the columns of Hercules to the Indian Ocean, I behold the nations of the earth recovering that liberty which they so long had lost ; and that the people of this island are transporting to other countries a plant of more beneficial qualities, and more noble growth, than that which Triptolemus is reported to have carried from region to region ; that they are disseminating the blessings of civilisation and freedom among cities, kingdoms and nations (1).

† (1) *Defensio secunda pro populo anglicano*, BOHN, I, pp. 218-20. ¶ ¶ ¶ ¶ ¶
Atque illi quidem Deo perinde confisi, servitute honestissimis armis populare : cujus laudis etsi nullam partem mihi vendico ; à reprehensione tamen vel timiditatis vel ignaviae, si qua infertur, facile me tueor. Neque enim militiae labores et pericula sic defugi, ut non alia ratione, et operam multo utiliore, nec minore cum periculo meis civibus navarim, et animum dubiis in rebus neque demissum unquam, neque ullius invidiae, vel etiam mortis plus æquo metuente præstiterim. Nam cum adolescentulo humanioribus essem studiis, ut qui maxime deditus, et ingenio semper quam corpore validior, posthabita castrensi opera, qua me gregarius quilibet robustior facile superasset, ad ea me contuli, quibus plus potui ; ut parte mei meliore ac potiore, si saperem, non deteriore, ad rationes patriæ, causamque hanc præstantissimam, quantum maxime possem momentum accederem. Sic itaque existimabam, si illos Deus res gerere tam præclaras voluit, esse itidem alios à quibus gestas dici pro dignitate atque ornari, et defensam armis veritatem, ratione etiam (quod unicum est præsidium vere ac proprie humanum) defendi voluerit. Unde est, ut dum illos invictos acie viros admiror, de mea interim provincia non querar ; immo mihi gratuler, et gratias insuper largitori munus celestis iterum summas agam obtigisse talem, ut aliis invidenda multo magis, quam mihi ullo modo poenitentia videatur. Et me quidem nemini vel infimo libens confero ; nec verbum de me ullum insolentius facio ; ad causam vero omnium nobilissimam, ac celeberrimam, et hoc simul defensores ipsos defendendi munus ornatissimam ipsorum mihi suffragiis attributum atque iudiciis, quoties animum refero, fateor me mihi vix temperare, quin altius atque audentius quam pro exordii ratione insurgam ; et grandius quiddam, quod eloqui possim, quæram : quando quidem oratores illos antiquos et insignes, quantum ego ab illis non dicendi solum sed et loquendi facultate (in extranea præsertim, qua utor necessario lingua, et persepe mihi nequaquam satisfacio) haud dubie vincor, tantum omnes omnium ætatum materiæ nobilitate et argumento vincam. Quod et rei tantam expectationem ac celebritatem adjecit, ut jam ipso me sentiam non in foro aut rostris, uno duntaxat populo, vel Romano, vel Atheniensi circumfusus ; sed attempta, et confidente quasi tota pene Europa, et iudicium ferente, ad universos quacunquæ gravissimorum hominum, urbium, gentium, consessus atque

For what style can be august and magnificent enough, what man has parts sufficient to undertake so great a task [the defence of the Commonwealth] ?... can any man have so good an opinion of his own talents, as to think himself capable to reach these glorious and wonderful works of Almighty God, by any language, by any style of his ? (1)

He alone is worthy of the appellation [of great man] who either does great things, or teaches how they may be done, or describes them with a suitable majesty when they have been done (2).

When I consider the good of the Commonwealth, I may indeed lament, that I alone was selected to defend the people of England, though I could not readily have endured an associate in the fame (3).

I have delivered my testimony, I would almost say, have erected a monument, that will not be readily destroyed, to the reality of these singular and mighty achievements, which were above all praise. (4)

For the cause of which he could speak thus, with his certainty of its righteousness and God's approval of it, it seems probable that Milton did not scrutinize too closely the means to such an end. Yet it does not follow that we must judge him as severely as Liljegren does. We must follow Liljegren, I think, in questions of fact, in which he has marshalled his documentation like a prosecuting attorney presenting his case, whereas the defence opposes but meager arguments which do not seem to be free from partiality. But many years passed in direct contact with Milton's works, drawing from his great poems a spiritual sustenance that no Machiavelli or Caesar could ever afford, make it impossible for me to interpret Milton as Liljegren does.

But let us summarize the facts as they seem to stand out from the preceding study, and set before ourselves in brief all that can possibly be said against Milton. The admired author of the *Aeropagitica* accepted with zeal the office of censor and shared without repugnance the ignoble functions of Sergeant Dendy (5) and the Intelligence Service. In the affair of the *Eikon Basiliké*, Milton probably played a rôle

conventus, et priore defensionem, dixisse, et hac rursus dicturum. Jam videor mihi, ingressus iter, transmarinos tractus et porrectas late regiones, sublimis perlustrare; vultus innumeros atque ignotos, animi sensus mecum conjunctissimos... Videor jam mihi, tantis circumseptus copiis, ab Herculeis usque columnis ad extremos Liberi patris terminos, liberatem diu pulsam atque exulem, longo intervallo domum ubique gentium reducere: et, quod Triptolemus olim fertur, sed longe nobiliorem Cereali illa frugem ex civitate mea gentibus importare; restitutum nempe civilem liberumque vitæ cultum, per urbes, per regna, perque nationes disseminare. (P. W., p. 708.)

(1) *Defensio pro populo anglicano*, BOHN, I, p. 4. « Quæ enim oratio tam augusta atque magnifica quod tam excellens ingenium, huic oneri subeundo par esse queat, ut, cum illustrium virorum aut civitatum res gestas vix reperiatur tot seculis... opinetur quisquam hæc, non hominum, sed omnipotentis plane Dei, gloriose et mirabiliter facta ullis se verbis aut stylo assequi posse ? » (P. W., p. 649).

(2) *Defensio secunda propopulo anglicano*, BOHN, I, p. 246. « Is solus magnus est appellandus qui res magnas aut gerit, aut docet, aut digne scribit. » (P. W., p. 716).

(3) *Op. cit.*, BOHN, I, p. 251-52. « Atque unum me esse inventum, qui causam populi Anglicani, tuear, si reipublica rationes cogito, sane quam doleo, si laudem, ejus participem habere me neminem facile patior. » (P. W., p. 718).

(4) *Op. cit.*, BOHN, I, p. 299. « ...ego quæ eximia, quæ excelsa, quæ omni laude prope majora fuere, iis testimonium, prope dixerim monumentum, perhibui, haud cito interituum. » (P. W., p. 732).

(5) *v. supra*, p. 13.

which was unworthy of an honourable man, being responsible for an interpolation that amounts to a forgery, to the detriment of the memory of a dead man. We are told that he found this amusing and laughed about it with Bradshaw. He did not hesitate to win over journalists and printers from their former loyalties and to make friends with these renegades. As he plunged deeper into political life, the tone of his prose became more and more coarse and ferocious ; and if the voice and style of a writer reveals what he is inwardly, then this must have represented a certain deterioration in Milton's spiritual fibre. He forsook the truth in that absolute sense in which it had held sway over his youth, and by omissions and half-truths and implications, if not by outright falsehoods, he willingly led his readers to believe what was not true. He confuses dates to his own advantage, or the advantage of his reputation. Where his motives for a certain action were various, he ignores the less noble. In vaunting the names of great men he had known, he leaves out those that might be prejudicial and perhaps adds gratuitously the greatest of all. In his quarrel with Salmasius, his ferocity probably hastened the poor man's death, and at any rate he boasts of that result as if this were true. He accuses Salmasius of something which the latter may have done, but which Milton himself certainly did.

This is the worst that can be said against Milton, and it all builds up into a considerable indictment. But I do not therefore believe that Liljegren's moral judgement upon Milton is the true one. Like those earlier Puritans of whom Maitland speaks (1), Milton never did anything which he himself « considered discreditable ». That great and severe moralist came out of his eleven years of political life with his conscience clear. He was certainly sincere when he wrote in the *Defensio Secunda* :

I again invoke the Almighty to witness that I never at any time wrote anything which I did not think agreeable to truth, to justice and to piety. This was my persuasion then, and I feel the same persuasion now. Nor was I ever prompted to such exertions by the influence of ambition, by the lust of lucre or of praise ; it was only by the conviction of duty and the feeling of patriotism, a disinterested passion for the extension of civil and religious liberty... I am unwilling to exchange my consciousness of rectitude with that of any other person. (2)

(1) *v. supra*, p. 67.

(2) БОНН, I, p. 237-39. « Quod etiam ullo tempore scripsi (quoniam hoc nunc me luere quasi piaculum regii existimant atque adeo triumphant) testor itidem Deum, me nihil istiusmodi scripsisse, quod non rectum et verum, Deoque gratum esse, et persuaserim tum mihi, et etiānum persuasus sim ; idque nulla ambitione, lucro, aut gloria ductus ; sed officii, sed honesti, sed pietatis in patriam ratione sola ; nec reipublicæ tantum, sed ecclesiæ quoque liberandæ causa potissimum fecisse... postremo nolle me cum suo quovis rectissime facto, facti mei conscientiam permutare... » (P. W. pp. 713 14).

He was sincere, yes. But his conscience had to reconcile itself to a burden of compromises and doubtful measures that the pure young poet of Horton certainly never contemplated. He who sought so earnestly to be himself a « true poem », did not foresee that he would ever have to justify his means. A subtle and gradual change must have taken place deep in his nature during the political years. If we concede that Milton did not suffer in his conscience for this, then we must assume that he had lost a measure of his power of self-criticism. Confusion of mind is the price of self-deception ; and self-deception — « rationalization » — is the only possible explanation of Milton's good conscience. Milton could hardly have had the clear-minded frankness in at once condemning and defending evil means that Cromwell shows in the letter to Lenthall after Drogheda, that certain reasons of expedience « are the satisfactory grounds to such actions, which otherwise cannot but work remorse and regret » (1)

Milton seems rather to lose sight entirely of all « remorse and regret » in order to take « that satisfaction in his achievement which is for him a psychological necessity » (2). If Hills's story can be believed, he seemed to take only pleasure in his recollections (3).

Liljegren cannot understand all this. And indeed it is sufficiently complicated. He judges as a Continental, with clarity. It is much easier for him to accuse Milton of moral defects than to believe that towering genius capable of confusion of mind. He takes no account of the profound need to « justify » oneself. If he did, he would, like all Europeans when judging the English, see in it nothing but hypocrisy. When the facts lead him to look at certain acts which Milton performed, he naturally concludes that they imply the same ideas and motives in Milton's mind that they would have implied in Machiavelli's. But it would be quite as unjust to the Italian as to the Englishman to draw the same implications from their acts. Machiavelli, a Latin, with his clear intelligence never deceives himself ; but he knows very well when he is deceiving others, and that it is in his own or his patron's interest.

But Milton disculpates himself in our eyes because whatever he did that seems open to criticism was never for himself, but for God. « My Kingdom is not of this world », says the Gospel, but Milton and Cromwell and his partisans sincerely believed that it could be. They thought they were about to realise it in practice. Nothing so great had ever been attempted on earth, and every means to such an end was good. But the God that could countenance such means in Mil-

(1) GARDINER, *History of the Commonwealth and Protectorate*, I, p. 124.

(2) v. the quotation from Hanford, *supra*. p. 88, note (3).

(3) v. *supra*. p. 26.

ton's conscience was no longer the pure cosmic deity of *On time* nor yet the Christian divinity of the *Hymn on the Nativity*. Jehovah had taken their place in Milton's soul, without his recognizing the difference, and was to figure as « Heaven's Mighty King » in *Paradise Lost*.

Milton deceived himself because he had to. It would have been too great a spiritual tragedy had he been forced to see himself as no longer the « true poem ». And he could deceive himself precisely because all that he did was for a supreme end and never for himself. Within the small domain of his personal life, he would have been obliged to judge truly, but there he did not have to have recourse to any self-deception. All the actions of his personal life could proudly abide his judgement, as they do ours.

Where his personal interests were concerned, it is impossible to criticise Milton. On the contrary, his personal life arouses the kind of admiration which we reserve for the most heroic moral probity and courage. At the end of his eleventh year of political life, a period during which many would have pillaged the state, he was poorer than at the beginning. In all his complicated and tiresome dealings with the outrageous Powell family, he was forbearing and magnanimous. In his decision to continue his work for the party despite the warning of his physicians that he would lose his sight thereby, he showed an intrepidity and abnegation, very rare.

Thus, therefore, when I was publicly solicited to write a reply to the Defence of the Royal Cause, when I had to contend with the pressure of sickness, and with the apprehension of soon losing the sight of my remaining eye, and when my medical attendants, clearly announced that if I did engage in the work, it would be irreparably lost, their premonitions caused no hesitation and inspired no dismay. I would not have listened to Esculapius himself from the shrine of Epidauris, in preference to the suggestions of the heavenly monitor within my breast ; my resolution was unshaken, though the alternative was either the loss of my sight, or the desertion of my duty. (1)

Then, having become blind, in his acceptance of his blindness he was nothing short of sublime :

It is not so wretched to be blind, as it is not be capable of enduring blindness. But why should I not endure a misfortune, which it behoves everyone

(1) *Defensio Secunda*, BOHN, I, p. 238. « Adeo ut cum datum mihi publice esset illud in defensionem regiam negotium eodemque tempore et adversa simul valetudine, et oculo jam pene altero amisso, conflictarer, prädicerentque diserte medici, si hunc laborem suscepissem, fore, ut utrumque brevi amitterem, nihil ista præmonitione deterritus, non medici, ne Aesculapii quidem Epidaurii ex adyto vocem, sed diviniore cujusdam intus monitoris viderer mihi audire ; duasque sortes, fatali quodam natu, jam mihi propositas, hinc cæcitatem, inde officium. (P. W., p. 713.)

to be prepared to endure if it should happen ; which may in the common course of things, happen to any man (1).

But if the choice were necessary, I would, sir, prefer my blindness to yours ; yours is a cloud spread over the mind, which darkens both the light of reason and of conscience ; mine keeps from my view only the coloured surfaces of things, while it leaves me at liberty to contemplate the beauty and stability of virtue and of truth... There is, as the apostle has remarked, a way to strength through weakness. Let me then be the most feeble creature alive, as long as that feebleness serves to invigorate the energies of my rational and immortal spirit ; as long as in that obscurity, in which I am enveloped, the light of the divine presence more clearly shines, then, in proportion as I am weak, I shall be invincibly strong, and in proportion as I am blind, I shall more clearly see (2).

Lastly, by the publication of the second edition of the *Ready and Easy Way to Establish a Free Commonwealth* (4) in the very face of Charles II's return, Milton risked everything for his principles, was actually imprisoned, and barely came off with his life (4).

Thus for Milton, the man, it seems to me that even admitting all the accusations listed above, we cannot draw Liljegren's conclusions from them. His years of political life seem to have left him capable of the same kind of lofty moral conduct as at the beginning of his manhood.

But it is far otherwise with Milton, the poet. The quality of his personal acts remains unchanged but not the quality of his nature.

And a man's nature is of the utmost importance for his poetry. It is his essence. Poetry wells up from the subconscious, and it was into his subconscious that Milton sank the spiritual consequences and sequels of all those political actions that his intelligence would have judged severely in the abstract. Between the forces at the surface of his conscious thoughts and those in the depths of his nature and his religious sense, there had begun a struggle, a sort of alternating current, of which the poet himself remained unaware.

It is useful at this point to contrast Milton with another great religious poet — Dante. Dante sinned. Yet but for him we should not know

(1) *Defensio secunda*, BOHN, I, p. 236. « ...non est miserum esse cæcum ; miserum est cæcitatem non posse ferre : quidni autem feram, quod unumquemque ita parare se oportet, ut si acciderit, non ægre ferat, quod et humanitas accidere cuivis mortalium. ». (P. W., p. 713).

(2) *Op. cit.*, BOHN, I, p. 239. « Ad cæcitatem denique quod attinet, malle me, ni necesse est, meam, quam vel suam, More, vel tuam. Vestra imis sensibus immersa, nequid sani videatis aut solidi, mentem obcæcat : mea, quam objicitis, colorem tantummodo rebus et superficiem demit ; quod verum ac stabile in iis est contemplationi mentis non adimit... Est quoddam per imbecillitatem, præunte Apostolo, ad maximas vires iter : sim ego debilissimus, dummodo in mea debilitate immortalis ille et melior vigor eo se efficacius exerat ; dummodo in meis tenebris divini vultus lumen eo clarius eluceat ; tum enim infirmissimus ero simul et validissimus, cæcus eodem tempore et perspicacissimus. (P. W., p. 714).

(3) S. M., pp 900-14

(4) MASSON VI pp. 566 sq

it, he himself informs us. His conscience is ulcerated with sins and he accuses himself. He confesses to Beatrice in a manner designed to make his pride bleed, and thus burns his sins out of his nature ; there remains nothing in his heart and soul that is troubled or hidden. Dante is clear, whole and unified. The conscious and the subconscious tend with all their force to the same end. The Florentine poet could draw equally on them both, as on his memories and hopes, his faith and his reason. Driven by his inner certitude and unity, the grandeur of his work has no other limits than those of his imagination and technique.

But if the interpretation offered in the present study is accepted, then it becomes evident that for Milton it was not so. There was a growing disunion in him between thought and sentiment, of which he was not conscious but which is of the greatest importance for understanding the three poems of his later years, especially for *Paradise Lost*. *Paradise Lost* is a poem that is not without incoherences, that at times contradicts itself. This is because strange contradictions and unsuspected shadows coexisted, unrecognized, in the poet's own soul, along with those other elements which all are agreed to call sublime. Their interplay and shock in the nature of a man who never became aware of them, were the source of the disconcerting contradictions that his greatest work displays (1). His political life explains many though not all of these.

(1) v. P. P. MORAND, *op cit.*, Part III, Chaps. III, IV, V, VI.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. « Anonymous Life of Milton ». v. Darbishire.
2. AUBREY, John. — Minutes of the Life of Mr. John Milton. v. Darbishire.
3. BROWN, Eleanor G. — « Milton's Blindness ». *Columbia University Studies in English and Comparative Literature*, New York, 1934.
4. CARLYLE, Thomas. — Oliver Cromwell's Letters and Speeches. 3 vols. London, Chapman and Hall, 1871.
5. DARBISHIRE, Helen. — The Early Lives of Milton. London, Constable, 1932.
6. GARDINER, S. R. — The Fall of the Monarchy. 2 vols. London, Longmans, Green, 1895.
7. — The First Two Stuarts and the Puritan Revolution. (« Epochs of Modern History »). London, Longmans, Green, 1913.
8. — History of the Great Civil War. 4 vols. London, Longmans, Green, 1893.
9. — History of the Commonwealth and the Protectorate, 4 vols., London, Longmans, Green, 1903.
10. — Oliver Cromwell. London, Longmans, Green, 1925.
11. GUIZOT, F. P. G. — *Etudes sur l'histoire de l'Angleterre : Portraits politiques des hommes des différents partis : Parlementaires, Cavaliers, Républicains, Niveleurs*. Paris, Didier, 1855.
12. — *Histoire de la République d'Angleterre*. 2 vols. Paris, Didier, 1864.
13. HANFORD, J. H. « Chronology of Milton's Private Studies, The. » *P.M.L.A.*, XXXVI (1921), pp. 251-314.

14. — « Creative Personality : the Case of John Milton ». *Johns Hopkins Alumni Magazine*, XV (June, 1927), pp. 328-52.
15. — « The Date of Milton's *De doctrina christiana* », *S.P.*, XVII (1920), pp. 309-19.
16. — *A Milton Handbook*. New-York, Crofts, 1927.
17. — « The Youth of Milton ». (In) *Studies in Shakespeare, Milton and Donne*, by Members of the English Department of the University of Michigan, New-York, Macmillan, 1925, pp. 89-163.
18. HAVENS, P. S. — « A Tract Long Attributed to Milton. » *Huntington Library Bulletin* No. 6 (1934), pp. 109-14.
19. JOHNSON, Samuel. — « John Milton. » (In) *Lives of the Poets*, vol. I, London, Dent. (*Everyman's Library*, No. 770.)
20. LILJEGREN, S. B. — « Milton and the King's Prayer. » *Beiblatt zur Anglia*, XXXVII (1926), pp. 91-94.
21. — « Miltons Wahl des Berufs. » *Beiblatt*, XXXV (1924), pp. 158-60.
22. — *Studies in Milton*. Lund, Gleerup, 1918.
23. MAITLAND, S. B. — *Essays on Subjects connected with the Reformation in England*. London, Rivington, 1849.
24. MASSON, David. — *The Life of John Milton : narrated in connection with the Political, Ecclesiastical and Literary History of his Time*. 6 vols. London, Macmillan, 1859 (vol. I, 2d ed., 1881).
25. MILTON, John. *Milton : Private Correspondence and Academic Exercises, Translated from the Latin by Phyllis B. Tillyard, With an Introduction and Commentary by E. M. W. Tillyard*. Cambridge, at the University Press, 1932.
26. — *Milton's Lament for Damon and his Other Latin Poems, rendered into English by Walter Skeat, with Preface and Introduction by E. H. Visiak*. London, Oxford University Press, Humphrey Milford, 1935.
27. — *Paradise Regained by John Milton, Newly edited with an Introduction and Commentary by E. H. Blakeney*. London, Eric Partridge, Ltd., at the Scholartis Press, 1932.
28. — *The Prose Works of John Milton, with a Preface, Preliminary Remarks, and Notes*, by J. A. St. John. 5 vol. (« Bohn's Standard Library »). London, Bohn, 1848.
29. — *The Prose Works of John Milton, with an Introductory Review by Robert Fletcher*, London, William Ball, 1838.

30. — *The Student's Milton, Being the Complete Poems of John Milton, with the greater part of his Prose Works, now printed in one volume, together with new translations into English of his Italian, Latin and Greek Poems, edited by F. A. Patterson.* New-York, Crofts, 1931.
31. — *The Works of John Milton.* 18 vols. New York, Columbia University Press, 1933.
32. NICOLSON, Marjorie H. — « Milton and the Telescope. » *ELH*, II (April, 1935), pp. 1-3.
33. PARKER, W. R. — « Milton's Unknown Friend », *Times Lit. Suppl.*, May 16, p. 420.
34. « Some Problems in the Chronology of Milton's Early Poems », *R. E. S.*, XI, pp. 276-83.
35. PARSONS, E. S. — « The Authorship of the Anonymous Life of Milton. » *P.M.L.A.*, L (Dec., 1935), pp. 1057-63.
36. PHILLIPS, Edward. — *The Life of Mr. John Milton.* v. Darbshire.
37. PHILLIPS, John. — *The Life of Mr. John Milton.* v. Darbshire.
38. RALEIGH, Sir Walter. — *Milton.* London, Edward Arnold, n. d.
39. RAND, E. K. — « Milton in Rustication », *S.P.*, XIX (April, 1922), pp. 109-35.
40. RAYMOND, Dora N. — *Oliver's Secretary : John Milton in an Era of Revolt.* New York, Minton, Balsh, 1932.
41. RICHARDSON, Jonathan. — « Explanatory Notes and Remarks on Milton's *Paradise Lost*, » London, 1734. v. Darbshire.
42. SAURAT, Denis. — *Milton : Man and Thinker.* New York, Dial Press, 1925.
43. SMART, J. S. — « Milton and the King's Prayer », *R.E.S.*, I (Oct., 1925), pp. 385-91.
44. STEVENS, D. H. — *Reference Guide to Milton from 1800 to the Present Day.* Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1930.
45. STOLL, E. E. *Poets and Playwrights : Shakespeare, Jonson, Spenser, Milton.* Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press, 1930.
46. TILLYARD, E. M. W. — *Milton.* London, Chatto and Windus, 1930.
47. — *The Miltonic Setting : Past and Present.* Cambridge University Press, 1938.
48. TOLAND, John. — *The Life of John Milton, 1698.* v. Darbshire.
49. WOLFE, D. M. — « Milton, Lilburne and the People », *M.P.*, XXXI (1934), pp. 253-72.
50. WOOD, Anthony à. — *From Fasti Oxoniensis or Annals of the University of Oxford. 1691.* v. Darbshire.

51. WRIGHT, B. A. — « Milton's First Marriage », *M.L.R.*, XXVI (Oct., 1931), pp. 381-400, XXVII (Jan., 1932), pp. 6-32.
-

VU :

Lyon, le 22 février 1939.

Le Doyen de la Faculté des Lettres,

KLEINCLAUSZ.

VU ET PERMIS D'IMPRIMER :

Lyon, le 24 février 1939.

Le Recteur, Président du Conseil de l'Université.

LIRONDELLE.

INDEX

A

Ad patrem, 70-71.
Allegro, I, 75.
 Almack, 32-6.
Animadversions, 57, 59, 72.
 Anglesey, Lord, 24, 47-9.
Apology for Smectymnuus, 59-66,
 74.
Arcadia, 23, 26-7, 36.
Areopagitica, 54-6, 81-6.
 Armstrong, John.
 Aubrey, John, 11, 96.
Authoris pro se Defension, 64, 98.

B

Barberini, Cardinal, 80-1.
 Bayley, Bishop, 44.
 Bernard, Dr. Francis, 26, 30.
 Bernhardt, 83, 85.
 Beverning, M. de, 95.
 Bigot, E., 19.
 Blakeney, E. H., 118.
 Bonomattei, 83.
 Bradshaw, John, 8, 26, 34, 105.
 Broghill, Lord, 105.
 Brown, Eleanor G., 85, note (9).
 Browne, S., 38.
Burmanni Sylloge Epist., 94.

C

Cambridge, Milton in, 57-8.
 Caryl, Dr., 22.
 Charles I, 20, 21, 23.
 Charles II, 24, 37, 40, 47.
 Christ, 8.
 Clarendon, Lord v. Hyde.
 Claudia Pelletta, 63.
 Clementillo, 83.
Colasterion, 11, 90.
Comus, 64, 84.
Considerations, 106.
 Cromwell, Henry, 105.
 Cromwell, Oliver, 16-18, 113.
 Cromwell, Richard, 105.
 Cultillero, 83.

D

Darbishire, Helen, 89, note (4).
 Dati, Carlo, 83.
*Defensio secunda pro populo angli-
 cano*, 76-7, 87, 102-4, 109-10,
 112, 114-5.
De doctrina christiana, 68-9.
 Dendy, E., 13, 14.
De idea platonica, 85.
 Diodati, Charles, 78.
 Diodati, John, 81, 83.

Doctrine and Discipline of Divorce,
64, 90.

Drogheda, 18, 113.

Dugard, William, 21, 26, 32-3,
35, 36.

Durie, James, 95.

E

Eikon, Aléthiné, 92-3.

Eikon Basiliké, 20-5, 92-3.

Eikonoklastes, 57-60, 92.

Elegy, First, 75.

Epitaphium Damonis, 77.

Everard, William, 17.

Evelyn, John, 40.

Exeter, Gauden, Bishop of, 24.

F

Fides Publica, 99.

Florence, Milton in, 82-4.

Fotherly, Mrs., 28-30, 39, 47.

Francesco, 83.

Frescobaldo, 83.

Frost, G., 12.

G

Gaddi, Jacopo, 83.

Galileo, 81-6, 91.

Gardiner, S. R., 16-18.

Gauden, Bishop, 24.

Gill, Alexander, 72.

Gill, Thomas, Dr. 26, 29.

Gregory Nazianzen, 58.

Gronovius, 94.

Grotius, Hugo, 83.

Guizot, F.-B.-G., 17, 18, 92.

H

Hacker, Col., 39.

Hall, Bishop, 73.

Hall, John, 13.

Hanford, J. H., 7, 46, 70-1, 86-7.

Harrington, Sir John, 27.

Hartlib, Samuel, 15, 19, 93.

Hatton, Sir Charles, 25.

Havens, P. S., 105, note (4).

Heinsius, 80, 94.

Henderson, Alexander, 37.

Herbert, Sir Thomas, 27, 29.

Hills, Henry, 25-30, 31, 32-7.

Holstenius, Lucas, 78, 81, 83.

Horton, 69-72, 74.

Hunscot, Joseph, 34.

Hyde, Chancellor, 24, 47.

I

Ingoldsby, Sir Richard, 40, 105.

J

James II., 24.

Jesuits, The, 78, 80.

Johnson, Samuel, 66.

Juxon, Bishop, 27, 28, 47.

L

Labadie, Jean 100-01.

Lambert, Gen., 105.

Letter to a Gentleman, 105.

Levellers, The, 16-17.

Lilburne, John, 12, 16, 17, 20.

Liljegren, S. B., 9, 25-8, 31-45, 50,

71, 78-9, 82, 87, 91, 99, 101,

102, 113.

Lycidas, 64, 73.

M

Mabbott, Gilbert, 55-6.

Maitland, S. B., 67.

Manso, Marquis of Villa, 80, 83.

Masson, David, 11, 12-17, 21-22, 34-5, 85, 92, 100-1, 107-8.
Mercurius Britannicus, 52-3.
Mercurius Politicus, 53-4, 93-4.
Mercurius Pragmaticus, 52-3.
 Millington, 24.
 More, v. Morus.
 Morus, Alexander, 60-5, 93-9.
 Moulin, Peter du, 96, 98.
 Mutschmann, H., 71.

N

Natura non pati senium, 85.
 Needham, Marchamont, 33-5, 52-4.
 Newgate, 34.
 Nicolson, Marjorie H., 9, 82, 86.
 Norton, 28, 30.

O

Observations on Ireland, 18, 57.
Of Education, 93.
Of Reformation, touching Church Discipline in England, 77.
On the Morning of Christ's Nativity, 9.

P

Pamela, 23.
 « Pamela Prayer », 23, 26, 38-9, 44, 47-8, 93.
Paradise Lost, 8, 84-5, 114, 116.
Paradise Regained, 8.
 Parker, W. R., 69, 70.
 Parsons, E. S., 70, note 5.
 Patterson, F. A., 118, 119.
 Pelletta, v. Claudia.
Penseroso, II, 79, n. 3.
 Pembroke, Countess of, 27.
 Phillips Edward, 84, 90.

Phillips, John, 84, 89, 90.
 Pontia, 61-3.
 Powell, Mary, 90-1.
Practice of Piety, The, 44-7.
Prolusions, 57-8.
Pro populo anglicano defensio, 35, 111.
 Prynne, W., 16.

R

Rabatta, Vincent, 54.
 Rand, E. K., 75.
 Raymond, D. N., 46-50, 86.
Ready and Easy Way to Establish a Free Commonwealth, The, 115.
Reason of Church Government urged against Prelaty, The, 58, 71, 72, 87, 89.
Regii sanguinis Clamor, 93-9.
Reliquiæ sacræ Carolinæ, 37-9.
 Richardson, Jonathan, 24, 59.
 Rodolphi, Nicolo, 55.
 Rome, Milton in, 76-81.
 Rump, The, 104-8.
 Royston, Richard, 21, 27-8, 30.

S

Salmasia, 60.
 Salmasius, 15, 60-3, 80, 101-04, 112.
Samson Agonistes.
 Satan, 8.
 Saumaise, v. Salmasius.
 Saumaise, M^{me}, 60.
 Saurat, D., 7, 9, 46.
 Scudamore, Lord, 83.
 Shelley, Percy Bysshe, 58.
 Sidney, Sir Philip, 23, 26, 58.
 Simmons, Matthew, 11, 22, 35, 36.
 Simon, Friar, 54.
 Skeat, Walter, 75.

Smart, J. S., 31, 33, 36-7, 40, 41-9,
91, 108.

Smectymnuus, 66, 73.

Stevens, D. H., 46.

Stoll, E. E., 46.

Stoupe, J. B., 19.

T

Tenure of Kings and Magistrates,
The, 11, 12, 57-8.

Terence, 63.

Tetrachordon, 11, 90.

Thaler, Alwyn, 76.

Thomason, 49-50.

Thomlinson, Colonel, 39-40.

Thompson, Francis, 58.

Thurloe, John, 96, 105.

Tillyard, E. M. W., 46, 50.

Tillyard, Phyllis, 73, 78, 81.

Toland, John, 24, 31.

Twisden, Mrs., 40.

U

Ulac, 93-4.

Ulitius, 94.

V

Visiak, E. H., 118.

Vossius, 94.

W

Wagstaffe, 25-30.

Walker, Anthony, 24.

Walker, Clement, 13, 33.

Wallingford House, 105-08.

Weckherlin, 11, 16.

Whitfield, Sir Ralph, 28.

Wolfe, D. M., 17, 105.

Wood, Anthony à, 34.

Wootton, Sir Henry, 83.

Wright, B. A., 89, 92.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	7
CHAPTER I : <i>Milton « Latin Secretary »</i>	II
CHAPTER II : <i>The Eikon Basiliké</i>	20
1. The Known Facts.....	20
2. Wagstaffe and Hills	25
3. Liljegren's Arguments.....	31
a) Corroboration of Hills.....	32
b) The Editions	37
4. The Arguments Opposed	41
CHAPTER III : <i>The Censorship</i>	52
CHAPTER VI : <i>The Evolution of Milton's Prose</i>	57
CHAPTER V : <i>Equivocations</i>	66
1. Milton's Refusal to enter the Church	69
2. Milton and the Theatre.....	73
3. The Return from Italy	76
4. The Jesuits and the Cardinal.....	78
5. Milton and Galileo.....	81
6. Hidden Motives	87
7. Identities.....	92
8. The Hundred Jacobuses	101
9. Opportunism.....	104
CONCLUSION	109
BIBLIOGRAPHY	117
INDEX.....	121

ACHEVÉ D'IMPRIMER LE 26 AVRIL 1939,
SUR LES PRESSES DE L'IMPRIMERIE CH.-A. BEDU,
A ST-AMAND-MONTROND ET A PARIS,
148, RUE DE RENNES

